

The African Bushmeat Crisis: A Case for Global Partnership

Andrew Kohn* and Heather E. Eves[±]

“The bushmeat trade... the unsustainable, illegal commercial sale of wildlife for meat consumption, is the most immediate, significant threat to wildlife populations in Central and West Africa.”¹

I. INTRODUCTION

Across Central Africa a commercial, unsustainable, and largely illegal hunting and trade in wildlife for meat has expanded in recent years causing immediate threat to countless wildlife populations and species. Currently, multi-national agreements and government initiatives created to address the bushmeat crisis in the region are unable to halt the extensive destruction to the area’s unique biodiversity². Although many of these agreements strongly support addressing the bushmeat crisis, they lack the resources and capacity to be fully implemented. Strong U.S. engagement in a global partnership, arising from intensive, complete, and wide-ranging bipartisan commitment would greatly enhance existing international biodiversity conservation efforts that prioritize the bushmeat crisis as the leading biodiversity threat across all landscapes in the region. The bushmeat crisis is not isolated in Africa. It has the potential to affect Americans and global citizens through emergent disease transmission from a growing international trade. Addressing global health threats is further linked through the bushmeat trade by additional U.S. government goals to support global democracy and international economic development.

This note aims to define “bushmeat”, explain why the issue has reached crisis proportion, and identify why the bushmeat issue is an issue of global concern and responsibility. It will use the North American Conservation Model as a template to suggest key components for a U.S. strategy to help mitigate the bushmeat crisis. Although this model is not entirely analogous to the African situation, the core components that made it successful have relevance and are informative to the situation today in Africa. It will then highlight current U.S. capacity building and funding mechanisms supporting international conservation as well as domestic and international involvement in biodiversity agreements. After looking at U.S. factors, it will provide an over-view of specific Central African range state collaborations, detailing their successes and need for greater support.

The bushmeat crisis as it currently exists is the greatest threat to biodiversity in Central Africa. There is an immediate need for more effective collaboration and resources to successfully address the issue. This need for increased collaboration includes the United States. As a world

*Andrew E. Kohn 2006. Third-year law student, Vermont Law School, South Royalton, Vermont.

[±] Heather E. Eves 2006. Director, Bushmeat Crisis Task Force, Washington, D.C.

¹ Heather Eves, J.T. Stein & D.S. Wilkie, *BCTF Fact Sheet: The Bushmeat Crisis in West and Central Africa* (2002), available at <http://www.bushmeat.org/docs.html>.

² See Heather E. Eves, *Chapter 9: The Bushmeat Trade in Africa: Conflict, Consensus, and Collaboration*, in *Gaining Ground: In Pursuit of Ecological Sustainability* (D.M. Levigne ed., 2006).

leader, it has the capacity and resources to play a key role regarding the crisis; including helping to direct a global partnership to address it.

II. THE BUSHMEAT CRISIS

“A voracious appetite for almost anything that is large enough to be eaten, potent enough to be turned into medicine, or lucrative enough to be sold, is stripping wildlife from wild areas -- leaving empty forests and an unnatural quiet.”³ Some national parks in developing countries are referred to as “paper parks” because they are exactly that, areas of land that are declared protected in official documents but lack proper resources and enforcement capabilities on the ground.⁴ Infrastructure development, increased private industry engagement and government-sponsored natural resource extraction (wood, oil, minerals) have led to the extension of roads into once remote, pristine forest environments. These roads facilitate the commerce of animal products for both personal and commercial consumption. This commercial bushmeat trade in Africa, left unaddressed, will decimate wildlife populations in the vast majority of natural areas within the next few years⁵.

Bushmeat (the trade focused primarily on supplying food demands) applies to all wildlife species, including many which are threatened and endangered with extinction. Forest elephant (*Loxodonta africana cyclotis*), gorilla (*Gorilla gorilla gorilla*), chimpanzee (*Pan troglodytes*), bonobo (*Pan paniscus*), forest antelope (*Cephalophus spp.*), crocodile (*Crocodylus spp.*, *Osteolaemus tetraspis*), porcupine (*Atherurus africanus*), and pangolin (*Manis gigantea*) are all targeted species along with numerous insects, amphibians, reptiles and wild birds.⁶ The primary driver supporting increased demands for this commercial bushmeat trade expansion has been amplified commercial logging⁷. With an infrastructure of roads and trucks that link forests and hunters to cities and consumers there is a direct connection between the devastating commercial bushmeat trade, logging and other extractive activities.

The Congo Basin is an important global resource. It maintains the second-largest dense humid tropical forest in the world, second only to the Amazon Basin, including 70% of Africa’s remaining rainforests.⁸ The Congo Basin forests of Central Africa, with over 400 mammal species, 1,000 bird species, and over 10,000 plant species (of which some 3,000 are endemic), encapsulates the greatest variety of flora and fauna in Africa.⁹ The forest holds half of the

³ Wildlife Conservation Society, <http://www.wcs.org/international/huntingandwildlifetrade> (last visited Dec. 1, 2005).

⁴ Bushmeat Crisis Task Force, *What is the Bushmeat Crisis and Why is it Important to Forest Management and Biodiversity Conservation?*, available at www.bushmeat.org (last visited April 23, 2006).

⁵ *Id.*

⁶ Threatened species include the Western Lowland Gorilla (*Gorilla gorilla gorilla*), the Common Chimpanzee (*Pan troglodytes*), and Bonobo (*Pan paniscus* – a great ape that, along with the chimpanzee, is the closest living relative to humans). For more information on these species visit the 2006 IUCN Red List of Threatened Species, available at <http://www.redlist.org>.

⁷ See Susan Minnemeyer et al., *An Analysis of Access to Central Africa’s Rainforests*, Global Forest Watch Congo Basin Forestry and World Resources Institute (2002), for a general discussion of commercial logging expansion.

⁸ The Jane Goodall Institute, http://www.janegoodall.co/chimps/chimps_bushmeat_b.html (last visited Feb. 4, 2006).

⁹ USAID, *The Forests of the Congo Basin: A Preliminary Assessment 4* (2005), available at http://www.carpe.umd.edu/products/PDF_Files/FOCB_APrelimAssess.pdf (last visited May 1, 2006).

continents wild species and is a natural and economic resource base supporting 83 million people.¹⁰

The bushmeat crisis is a human tragedy because the loss of wildlife threatens the livelihoods, food security, and cultural practices of indigenous and rural populations most dependent on wildlife.¹¹¹² In the Congo Basin of Central Africa the trade is estimated to be on average six times the sustainable rate.¹³

An ever-expanding world population and good governance issues throughout the developing world remain two major obstacles in effective conservation strategy implementation. The United Nations has predicted the world population to increase from 6.5 billion to 9.1 billion by the year 2050; with the human population growing by 3,000 every twenty minutes (while at the same time interval another plant or animal becomes extinct).¹⁴

The vast majority of this population expansion – an estimated 95% - is occurring in the developing world¹⁵. Unfortunately, those countries with the greatest threats to biodiversity are those with extreme population growth and governments which are often unable to meet the needs of existing populations, much less expanded ones¹⁶. Creative solutions to land use best practices and wildlife management policies in such a challenging environment requires a coordinated effort and action planning. This effort must engage the broader global community, range state governments, private industry and local communities supported by a collaborative plan and the necessary technical and financial resources to be effective.

III. FACTORS THAT MAKE THE BUSHMEAT ISSUE A U.S. AND A GLOBAL PRIORITY

The bushmeat crisis has the potential to affect the United States in three major ways. Without immediate government recognition of the crisis and proper financing it will only be a matter of time before these predicted impacts become reality. The first is the threat of global pandemic. Wildlife disease transmission is a major threat not only to domestic, livestock, and wild species, but to human populations as well. The second is the desire to expand democracy and good governance practices across the globe for improved natural resource and economic management. Unstable governments lack the power to control illegal activities within their borders. Helping range countries develop sound conservation policy and good governance leads to the re-introduction, or in some cases introduction, of law and order in volatile regions. The third is to encourage responsible economic development by promoting and nurturing stable natural environments.

¹⁰ See The World Bank, <http://devdata.worldbank.org/hnpstats/HNPDemographic/total.pdf> (last visited Sept. 12, 2006).

¹¹ The Bushmeat Crisis Task Force, <http://www.bushmeat.org/whatis.html> (last visited Mar. 3, 2006).

¹² Rebecca Hardin & Melissa J. Remis, *Biological and Cultural Anthropology of a Changing Tropical Forest: A Fruitful Collaboration Across Subfields*, *American Anthropologist* 108, No. 2 (June 2006).

¹³ Parliamentary Office of Science and Technology, *The Bushmeat Trade* (2005), available at <http://www.parliament.uk/documents/upload/POSTpn236.pdf> (last visited May 4, 2006).

¹⁴ Germany World Population Fund, <http://www.overpopulation.org/faq.html> (last visited Apr. 6, 2006).

¹⁵ Eves, *supra* note 2.

¹⁶ United States Agency for International Development, *Strategic Framework for Africa* (Feb. 24, 2006).

A. Disease

Disease prevention is a topic not only of U.S. concern, but of global significance. Monkeypox, Ebola, HIV, and avian flu are all diseases that originate in wildlife. In June 2003, a monkeypox outbreak occurred in the United States after people came in contact with infected animals that had been housed with imported rodents from Africa.¹⁷ The virus originates in Central and West Africa and infects squirrels, rats, mice, and rabbits.¹⁸ Ebola outbreaks in African communities, originating from a yet unknown source, occur repeatedly in Central Africa and are often linked to the consumption of bushmeat.¹⁹ In one instance, a hunting party of fifteen in Gabon came across a dead silverback gorilla that they butchered, cooked, and ate; within a few weeks, only two people had survived the experience. It was later discovered they had eaten a gorilla that died from Ebola.²⁰ It is believed that bushmeat is the most likely vector for the HIV/AIDS pandemic.²¹ A similar virus (Simian Immunodeficiency Virus – SIV) is found in chimpanzees and sooty mangabeys. When exposed to infected animals, hunters provided a vector for the successful mutation of SIV in HIV.²² These linkages between wildlife and health have resulted in emerging collaborative efforts to address the threats to not only humans but also other domestic animals and wildlife in nations where bushmeat is being traded – including the US.²³

A major wildlife borne illness that has recently made headlines is the avian flu. Avian influenza (AI) is highly contagious and can easily spread from wild migrating birds to domestic poultry populations.²⁴ The bushmeat implications are obvious; a hunter kills a wild, infected bird and brings it home for dinner. The possibility of domestic animals stock infection, as well as human infection, is increased dramatically when the animal is taken out of its natural habitat. Infected birds spread AI through “their saliva, nasal secretions, and feces” leaving the virus behind when they have left the scene.²⁵ Recent research has suggested that the 1918 Spanish Flu pandemic, that killed approximately 20 million people worldwide, was originally a form of avian flu.²⁶ Avian flu has already reached Africa and with the potential losses of wild and domestic birds there will be even more pressure put on wildlife species for bushmeat.²⁷ With the extensive

¹⁷ Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, <http://cdc.gov/ncidod/monkeypox/factsheet2.htm> (last visited Dec. 25, 2005). These prairie dogs were purchased as pets in the United States.

¹⁸ *Id.*

¹⁹ Bushmeat Crisis Task Force, <http://www.bushmeat.org/crisisalert.htm#ebola2002> (last visited Dec. 25, 2005).

²⁰ Dale Peterson, *Eating Apes* 80-81 (2003).

²¹ Beatrice H. Hahn et al., *AIDS as a Zoonosis: Scientific and Public Health Implications*, *Science* 287, at 607 (Jan. 2000).

²² “Bushmeat” and the Origin of HIV/AIDS – A Case Study of Biodiversity, Population Pressures, and Human Health, A Congressional Briefing, (Feb. 19, 2002), available at <http://www.med.harvard.edu/chge/biobrief.html> (last visited Dec. 17, 2005).

²³ Emma Marris, *Bushmeat Surveyed in Western Cities* *Nature* (June 2006), available at <http://www.nature.com/news/2006/060626/full/060626-10.html>.

²⁴ Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Avian Flu, <http://www.cdc.gov/flu/avian/gen-info/facts.htm> (last visited Mar. 28, 2006).

²⁵ *Id.*

²⁶ Yale Global Online, Avian Flu, <http://yaleglobal.yale.edu/reports/avianflu.jsp> (last visited Mar. 28, 2006).

²⁷ Charles Ozeomena & Tony Ubani, *Bird Flu Hits Nigeria, Kills 46,000 Chickens*, *Vanguard* (Feb. 9, 2006), available at <http://www.vanguardngr.com/articles/2002/cover/february06/09022006/f309022006.html> (last visited July 7, 2006).

international markets actively trading bushmeat from Africa throughout Europe and the US²⁸, it is only a matter of time before disease impacts US wildlife, domestic animals and/or citizens.

B. *Fostering Democracy*

Fair distribution of natural resource products and revenues within range states will foster government transparency and allow the general populace to witness first-hand the usefulness of protecting national biodiversity and natural resources.²⁹ Most Africans live in abject poverty while those with wealth continue to accrue it at the expense of the populace; leaders frequently come into office with the hope of controlling natural resource extraction for their benefit.³⁰ Mismanagement of natural resources and the profits that develop from them only foster a desire by the “haves” to have more and by the “have-nots” to resent those in power. “So long as people are oppressed by the lack of such (natural resource) ownership and control, so long will they continue to be cheated of their right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, cheated out of their enjoyment of the earth and all it contains.”³¹ A negative view of wildlife by indigenous peoples is inevitable under the current framework in many nations. “Resentment and envy is directed against the privileged; (and) wildlife becomes a symbol of detested privilege and power.”³²

These sentiments regarding natural resource use and benefits underscore larger issues of governance that plague Africa. Good governance was recently described by World Bank President, Paul Wolfowitz, as being, “...essentially the combination of transparent and accountable institutions, strong skills and competence, and a fundamental willingness to do the right thing. Those are the things that enable a government to deliver services to its people efficiently. An independent judiciary, a free press, and a vibrant civil society [are] important components of good governance.”³³ Democratic use and management of wildlife is highly dependent on such good governance practices which are still emerging in much of Central Africa.

While there have been a number of attempts over the last two decades in many parts of Africa to integrate conservation and development goals in projects through increased participation by local communities, most of these efforts have failed to achieve success particularly in stated conservation goals.³⁴ The increased involvement of local communities in land-use planning activities, while critically important to long-term resource management, is challenged by a foundation of extreme poverty that cannot be overcome without a combination of alternatives

²⁸ Marris, *supra* note 23.

²⁹ Nicholas P. Lapham, *A Natural Resource Conservation Initiative for Africa*, in *Rising U.S. Stakes in Africa: Seven Proposals to Strengthen U.S.-Africa Policy* 88, 96 (J. Stephen Morrison ed., 2004).

³⁰ *Id.*

³¹ *Id.* at 94. Quoting Gifford Pinchot, *Breaking New Ground* (1947).

³² Valerius Geist, *How Markets in Wildlife Meat and Parts, and the Sale of Hunting Privileges, Jeopardize Wildlife Conservation*, *Conservation Biology* 2, No.1, at 22 (1988).

³³ Paul Wolfowitz, *Good Governance and Development: A Time for Action*, Address Given in Jakarta, Indonesia (Apr. 11, 2006), available at www.worldbank.org.

³⁴ Arun Agrawal & Kent Redford, *Poverty, Development, and Biodiversity Conservation: Shooting in the Dark?* Wildlife Conservation Society, Working Paper, No. 26 (March 2006) (on file with author).

(protein and income) as well as enforcement activities.³⁵ Such programs will be successful only in a framework of improved governance structures, mechanisms and capacity.

C. Economic Development

“Whenever humans live at high population densities, making unsustainable demands on natural systems...you eventually see ecological breakdown, unmet needs, and tensions that lead toward conflict.”³⁶ For economic development to be successful, it is important that natural resources are managed with the goal of long-term sustainability. Unfortunately this is not the case through much of Africa. Poverty alleviation and biodiversity conservation have often been lumped together in programs meant to address economic disparities in developing countries, often not receiving equal attention in the process.³⁷ Biodiversity, especially, has often been associated with the broader term “nature,” simplifying the concept into a one-word definition and easily affixing it to poverty alleviation programs.³⁸ Biodiversity, however, is a complex term and without addressing its components directly, poverty alleviation will be attempted at the expense of responsible natural resource management practices – particularly where wildlife is concerned.³⁹ The results will ultimately be an eroded natural resource base disabling the poorest communities the facility to meet basic needs.

This assumption that both biodiversity conservation and poverty alleviation can be achieved in one program will, in reality, fail unless conservation organizations and development entities have the resources and mandate to fully utilize their unique skillsets and work in cooperation instead of the current climate of competition (*i.e.* choices often are made to meet this generation’s immediate needs at the expense of future generation needs). “If one cannot make definitive statements about whether a particular policy measure can alleviate all aspects of poverty or conserve all components of biodiversity, surely it is foolhardy to hazard that a particular policy can simultaneously alleviate poverty per se *and* conserve biodiversity.”⁴⁰ Human population densities in West Africa are 4-5 times higher than those in Central Africa, and in these locations wildlife has become locally extinct across broad areas due to bushmeat hunting and loss of habitat.⁴¹ As roads are created to allow for market access to help induce poverty alleviation they create avenues into the forests for biodiversity extraction.⁴²

The bushmeat crisis is a critically important modern-day challenge for both African and global citizens. While each maintains a variety of values attached to these Central African wildlife

³⁵ See Heather Eves & Richard Ruggiero, *Socio-economics and the Sustainability of Hunting in the Forests of Northern Congo (Brazzaville)*, in HUNTING FOR SUSTAINABILITY IN TROPICAL FORESTS (J.G. Robinson et al. eds., 2000).

³⁶ David Quammen, *Tracing the Human Footprint*, National Geographic 208, No. 3, at 20 (Sept. 2005). Quoting Mike Fay, Wildlife Conservation Society scientist and participant of the Mega-Flyover project.

³⁷ Agrawal, *supra* note 34 at 2.

³⁸ *Id.* at 12.

³⁹ Eves, *supra* note 2.

⁴⁰ *Id.* at 32.

⁴¹ Bushmeat Crisis Task Force, *What is the Bushmeat Crisis and Why is it Important to Forest Management and Biodiversity Conservation?* (2005), available at <http://www.bushmeat.org/cd/fs/BCTFBRIE.pdf> (last visited May 2, 2006).

⁴² David Wilkie et al, *Roads, Development, and Conservation in the Congo Basin*, Conservation Biology 14, No. 6, at 1614-1622 (2000).

resources, immediate economic, health, and land-use policy related issues hinder the ability of the few technical experts, low-capacity government institutions, and poverty-laden local communities present to adequately address the crisis. It is important, therefore, to identify other models of wildlife conservation that have shown success and identify what, if any, components of those models might be applicable to the Central African situation.

IV. UNITED STATES CONSERVATION HISTORY

The first wildlife refuge in the United States was Pelican Island, Florida, created in 1903 by President Theodore Roosevelt who led a comprehensive conservation effort in the US.⁴³ Pelican Island signaled the beginning of the North American wildlife conservation model highlighted in 1916 with the National Park Service Act.⁴⁴ The North American model of wildlife conservation has been successful because of three fundamental policies: 1) the absence of economic value for dead animals 2) the control of wildlife by federal and state law (not by “the market place, birth right, land ownership, or social position,”) and 3) the non-frivolous use of animal and plant species.⁴⁵ These basic tenets of the US model were supported by the establishment of a formal profession for wildlife management which supported conservation planning based on scientific research and engagement with citizens.

The greatest success story of the early conservation movement was the return of the American Bison from the brink of extinction. The bison population in the United States plummeted from 30 million in the mid-eighteenth century to a few hundred by the early twentieth century.⁴⁶ Decimated by hunting for tongue and hide, this population was saved from the brink of extinction by a collection of elite hunters and capitalists joining to collectively form the American Bison Society.⁴⁷ Today, bison are the keystone species of a wildlife industry in the United States that grosses approximately \$60 billion annually, placing value on enjoyment of living wildlife.⁴⁸ The key to this success was the shift from private use to public ownership – managed by professionals - of wildlife, with recognition that private control of wildlife would decrease the economic return.⁴⁹ In addition, the closing of wildlife markets and placing value on living wildlife resources over dead wildlife resources was a cornerstone of the North American model of wildlife conservation.

V. WHY THE NORTH AMERICAN CONSERVATION MODEL WORKED COMPARED WITH THE CENTRAL AFRICAN CASE

The North American Conservation Model worked in the United States for a few very important reasons.⁵⁰ First, the recovery of wildlife was effectively planned on a continent-wide basis.⁵¹

⁴³ Ruth Musgrave, *Federal Wildlife Law of the 20th Century* (1998), available at <http://www.animallaw.info/articles/arusfedwildhistory.htm> (last visited Dec. 17, 2005).

⁴⁴ *Id.*

⁴⁵ Geist *supra* note 32, at 15-16.

⁴⁶ ANDREW ISENBERG, *THE DESTRUCTION OF THE BISON* 12 (2000).

⁴⁷ *Id.* at 166.

⁴⁸ Geist, *supra* note 32, at 15.

⁴⁹ *Id.* at 16.

⁵⁰ With increased assistance, a regional approach may develop that reflects the successes of the North American Conservation Model.

Wildlife migration across landscapes was relatively easily managed in North America. With such an expansive area, the U.S. government could negotiate for large areas uninhabited by peoples in the early twentieth century and reserve them for wildlife. Most modern-day citizens, therefore, have grown up around areas reserved for wildlife.

Citizen recognition of wild lands is commonplace in the US today. There is a targeted concern parallel to US wildlife management history and Africa's current situation, however, involving indigenous communities and land-use rights. The Native American population and nations have a long history of land-use negotiations in the US that have evolved in the case of wildlife management to relationships of true partnership.⁵² The development of indigenous land use rights following histories of private industry exploitation and government land use control is still very much in its infancy across much of Africa with many programs emerging in recent decades that engage participation of local communities in wildlife management processes.⁵³ Unfortunately, many of these programs are as yet unsuccessful due largely to massive poverty that disables citizens from making decisions motivated by a priority for conservation.⁵⁴ Meeting immediate nutritional and economic needs through natural resource exploitation is the priority for most citizens in this environment of extreme poverty and lacking alternatives or opportunities.

The second primary factor behind the success of wildlife management in the US is the industry of wildlife that provides both economic wealth and employment based on the living wildlife resource.⁵⁵ This industry based on living wildlife is supported by overall wealth contained by the average citizen in North America that enables workers to go on vacation and enjoy areas outside of the urban environment. Such a large middle class is largely absent in much of Africa. In the United States, the GDP per capita is \$40,100,⁵⁶ while in Kenya it is \$1,100⁵⁷ and in the Democratic Republic of Congo it is \$700.⁵⁸

In Central Africa there are limited opportunities for wildlife tourism on the scale present in countries like Kenya and Southern Africa that obtain a dominant percentage of foreign currency earnings through this living wildlife based industry. The infrastructure, field conditions and language barriers present in Central Africa limit eco-tourism as a major foreign exchange earner from many foreign tourists. Sport hunting is present in this region but still results in the majority of funds remaining outside local communities or wildlife ministries, thus minimizing the positive impacts such wildlife industry revenues might otherwise have in encouraging local communities to place higher value on living wildlife. Currently there are only limited examples of wealth

⁵¹ Valerius Geist, *The North American Model of Wildlife Conservation as Means of Creating Wealth, Protecting Public Health while Generating Wildlife Biodiversity*, IN GAINING GROUND: IN PURSUIT OF ECOLOGICAL SUSTAINABILITY (D.M. Lavigne ed., 2006).

⁵² The Native American Policy of the US Fish and Wildlife Service (1994) (on file with author).

⁵³ Eves, *supra* note 2.

⁵⁴ *Id.*

⁵⁵ Geist, *supra* note 51.

⁵⁶ World Fact Book, United States, <http://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook/geos/us.html> (last visited Dec. 21, 2005).

⁵⁷ World Fact Book, Kenya, <http://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook/geos/ke.html> (last visited Dec. 21, 2005).

⁵⁸ World Fact Book, Democratic Republic of Congo, <http://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook/geos/cg.html> (last visited Apr. 6, 2006).

accumulating to local communities based on wildlife industry development and sport hunting, which is still in its infancy in this part of Africa.⁵⁹

Third, there is great public involvement in wildlife in North America.⁶⁰ North American populations engage in a number of activities linked with wildlife including zoo visitation (currently Association of Zoos and Aquariums (AZA)-accredited institutions in the US annually receive more than 142 million visitors which is more than all major sporting events – NFL, NBA, and MLB – combined)⁶¹, hunting, camping, hiking, photography and many others. Values of wildlife among the majority of the US population are largely linked with existence of wildlife and less so with utilitarian views.

The average citizen in both urban and rural areas of Central Africa has a largely utilitarian view of wildlife which attends to the basic nutritional and economic benefits derived from the wildlife resource.⁶² In contrast, demands for wildlife conservation from the global citizenry are based on values of ecosystem services and option (to use), existence (continued), and bequest (for future generations). Such a disparity of wealth and values suggests that since the costs of long term wildlife presence are largely born by local communities these more aesthetic values being promoted by an external global citizenry should be financially supported by that global community – and largely by governments.⁶³

Fourth, in the United States, citizens have taxed themselves to support wildlife, beginning with the American Game Conference in 1930.⁶⁴ Revenues generated from such taxation and wildlife use have funded wildlife conservation programs and enabled the emergence of a strong wildlife profession. Because of the relatively low-income levels in many African countries a tax for wildlife is impracticable, where the very real concern of finding enough food for one's family still exists. Responsible investment and management of funds must take place if wildlife is to continue to exist in Africa and such funds will largely have to come from the global community.⁶⁵

Fifth, the United States was able to concern itself with habitat conservation and then enforce this conservation through law.⁶⁶ Although there is considerable existing legislation already in place across Central Africa that restricts hunting activities including the bushmeat trade, African countries lack the resources and political will to fund adequate law enforcement efforts in national parks and reserves.⁶⁷ Often, an individual in Africa can make better money working as

⁵⁹ See L. Usongo & B.T. Nkanje, *Participatory approaches toward forest conservation: The case of Lobeke National Park, South east Cameroon*, International Journal of Sustainable Development and World Ecology 11, No. 2 (2004).

⁶⁰ Geist, *supra* note 51.

⁶¹ American Zoological Association, <http://www.aza.org/AboutAZA/CollectiveImpact1/> (last visited July 8, 2006)

⁶² Eves & Ruggiero, *supra* note 35.

⁶³ See A. Balmford and T. Whitten, *Who should pay for tropical conservation and how could the costs be met?*, ORYX 37, No. 2 (2003).

⁶⁴ Geist, *supra* note 51.

⁶⁵ Balmford, *supra* note 63.

⁶⁶ Geist, *supra* note 51.

⁶⁷ CITES Bushmeat Working Group, Thirteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties Bangkok (Thailand), 2-14 October 2004 available at <http://www.bushmeat.org/cd/meetings/CITES%2013-62-1.pdf> (last visited May 18, 2006).

a poacher than as a park ranger.⁶⁸ Regional approaches to conservation look to involve the community and use local populations to manage local resources but this will likely still require law enforcement components.

Finally, “law enforcement in North America enforcing conservation law is normally a remarkably civil affair (and) because wildlife conservation is broad-based and an exercise in participatory democracy, there is much self-policing involved.”⁶⁹ Democracy and good governance are long-held values in North America. In Africa’s rapidly changing landscape there are dramatic impacts on social and community structures that cause breakdowns in traditional forms of wildlife management and governance. There emerges a need for a more collaborative approach to wildlife management that includes targeted mechanisms for law enforcement coupled with alternatives and awareness raising.⁷⁰

Is there an opportunity for some or all components of the North American model of wildlife conservation to be relevant in the Central African bushmeat crisis? Keys to success would likely involve region-wide planning, improved land-use and wildlife management systems, law enforcement, capacity building, protein and income alternatives, and poverty alleviation. These components require long-term commitment and funding to support a comprehensive approach that creates an enabling environment for conservation and development success to emerge in this critical global landscape. The North American Conservation Model may prove a viable outline for future Central African range state policies if adequately supported, both financially and technically, by developed countries. We now look more closely at mechanisms needed to encourage the emergence of such components in the United States and in Central Africa.

VI. UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT INVOLVEMENT IN SUPPORTING INTERNATIONAL BIODIVERSITY CONSERVATION

The United States maintains existing and significant opportunities for supporting such a collaborative approach to addressing the preservation of Central African biodiversity. Four major government-supported programs that could contribute to this objective are: 1) The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service *Multinational Species Conservation Funds* and *Wildlife Without Borders* (WWB), 2) The Global Environment Facility (GEF), 3) The Central Africa Regional Program for the Environment (CARPE) with its international partnership program the Congo Basin Forest Partnership (CBFP), and 4) The Congressional International Conservation Caucus. Although these programs have laid the groundwork for comprehensive U.S. involvement in biodiversity conservation in African and the Congo Basin in particular, they require continued government support and improved balance between conservation and development activities to make them viable long-term programs. If the bushmeat crisis is to be addressed effectively, it will require the commitment of donor nations through such programs well into the foreseeable future.

⁶⁸ Peterson, *supra* note 20, at 116. (“A study in Cameroon found hunters able to earn up to \$650, while another regional study reporting earnings of between \$250 and \$1,050 annually through killing and selling.”)

⁶⁹ Geist, *supra* note 51.

⁷⁰ Bushmeat Crisis Task Force, *BCTF Phase I Report 2000-2004*, available at <http://www.bushmeat.org/cd/report.html> (last visited July 26, 2006).

A. Multinational Species Conservation Funds and Wildlife Without Borders

The USFWS administered Multinational Species Conservation Funds are supported by government appropriations for programs that focus on bi-lateral support for capacity building in and conservation of the African and Asian elephant, apes, marine turtles, rhinoceros, and tiger populations throughout the world.⁷¹ These programs were started in different years beginning with the African Elephant Conservation Fund (1998) to the most recent Marine Turtle Conservation Fund (2005). Although most of the funds carry an authorization of up to US\$5 million, most receive allocations far less than that. Through FY 2005, federal funding for all the species conservation funds equaled \$36,785,376.⁷² For fiscal year 2006, the government appropriated \$6.5 million to the various funds.⁷³ While this funding is commendable, the majority of actual project funding needs comes from non-government organization matching grants which have reached \$100,559,683 through FY 2005.⁷⁴ Even with the limited appropriations approved each year these funds have made significant impacts in holding back what would otherwise most likely be a massive negative impact on wildlife globally. Although these funds are not targeted at the bushmeat crisis, the activities they support help to minimize impacts of illegal hunting and trade. Funding at least the current full authorization for all these funds would dramatically impact efforts on the ground as these are the only funds dedicated strictly to conservation-linked activities and are not mandated to be diverted to development activities as other programs (*e.g.* USAID Biodiversity Conservation Program, World Bank GEF) are. These funds also link together the specialized expertise of wildlife and habitat managers across nations that can dramatically enhance conservation outcomes.

Wildlife Without Borders - Africa is a program also located within the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Division of International Conservation with the mission to “strengthening the technical capacity of Africans to manage their resources.”⁷⁵ Through capacity building the program hopes to address issues including the bushmeat crisis and wildlife disease.⁷⁶ WWB-Africa, launched in 2006, joined a host of other regional programs including those in Latin America, China, and India.⁷⁷ Funding of WWB-Africa is allocated at a very limited \$100,000 for the fiscal period

⁷¹ United States Fish and Wildlife Service, <http://www.fws.gov/international/dicprograms/speciesprogram.htm> (last visited Jan. 5, 2006).

⁷² U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, http://www.fws.gov/international/pdf/multi_funds_history_jan_06.pdf (last visited Jan. 5, 2006). This funding amount represents the programs inception through FY 2005. As an example, the African elephant program began in 1998 and receives grants of approximately \$1,000,000 per year. For more information about individual programs visit their specific websites within FWS. Information on the African elephant can be found at <http://www.fws.gov/international/afecf/afecf.htm>.

⁷³ CONSERVATION INTERNATIONAL, THE NATURE CONSERVANCY, THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION SOCIETY, AND THE WORLD WILDLIFE FUND, LEAFLET NO. 2, THE INTERNATIONAL CONSERVATION BUDGET 16 (2006). The funding was up from the \$5.8 million appropriated in FY2005.

⁷⁴ U.S.F.W.S., *supra* note 72.

⁷⁵ United States Fish and Wildlife Service, <http://www.fws.gov/international/dicprograms/wwbp.htm> (last visited Jan. 5, 2006).

⁷⁶ *Id.*

⁷⁷ United States Fish and Wildlife Service, http://www.fws.gov/international/pdf/regional_program_jan06.pdf (last visited Jan. 5, 2006). The WWB-Latin America Program began in 1983 with a budget of \$150,000 and is currently funded at over \$1,000,000 annually. United States Fish and Wildlife Service, http://library.fws.gov/IA_Pubs/wwb_latinam_carib02.pdf (last visited May 8, 2006).

ending in September 2006.⁷⁸ This program is positioned to provide an important complement to the Multinational Species Conservation Funds as it covers specific issues linked with bushmeat, disease, human and wildlife conflict and capacity building (e.g. building the wildlife profession internationally which is key to successful conservation as the North American Model of Conservation has shown in the US and Canada). Allocation of funding to this program for Central Africa should be on the order of magnitude of tens of millions and not hundreds of thousands of dollars annually.

B. Global Environment Facility (GEF)

The Global Environment Facility (GEF) was founded in 1991 with the mission to help “developing countries fund projects and programs that protect the global environment.”⁷⁹ GEF funding supports projects in six distinct areas: biodiversity, climate change, international waters, land degradation, the ozone layer, and persistent organic pollutants.⁸⁰ The United States became a member of GEF on June 24, 1994.⁸¹ GEF receives funding every four years through a process known as “GEF Replenishment,” with 32 members contributing \$3 billion (US) for the period 2002 through 2006. For the fiscal year 2006, the United States pledged \$80 million to the GEF.⁸² While biodiversity is one of six areas of support within GEF, a keyword search of “bushmeat” in the GEF projects database from 1991 through 2006 returns no direct results, though a single project in Gabon from 1995-1998 to study the wildlife trade there was conducted using a US\$1 million GEF grant.⁸³ GEF is an obvious potential funding source for issues linked with wildlife trade since it is the funding implementation for CBD and other important conventions and should be explored and integrated as a targeted source of funds to address the bushmeat crisis. Like other government-related development initiatives linked with the environment, however, this program falls short on achieving results with actual improved and secured natural resources [INSERT REFERENCE HERE – SEE FORWARDED EMAIL WITH REPORT FROM DFID]. A review of funding allocations evaluating the balance of funding for actual protection vs. development is needed. An assessment of actual conservation outcomes is immediately needed for this program.

C. CARPE and the Congo Basin Forest Partnership

An additional U.S. program having capacity to provide support for addressing the bushmeat crisis is the Central Africa Regional Program for the Environment (CARPE). CARPE is a twenty-year initiative, beginning in 1995, with the goal to “reduce deforestation and loss of biological diversity in Central Africa.”⁸⁴ The program is spearheaded by the U.S. Agency for

⁷⁸ H. REP. NO. 109-188 (2006) available at http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/cpquery/?&dbname=cp109&sid=cp109wzGJ8&refer=&r_n=hr188.109&item=&sel=TOC_234205& (last visited May 3, 2006).

⁷⁹ Global Environment Facility, <http://www.gefweb.org/> (last visited Mar. 28, 2006).

⁸⁰ *Id.*

⁸¹ Global Environment Facility, http://www.gefweb.org/participants/Members_Countries/members_countries.html#u (last visited Mar. 28, 2006).

⁸² International Conservation Budget, *supra* note 73, at 8.

⁸³ Global Environment Facility, Project Database, <http://gefonline.org/home.cfm> (last visited July 9, 2006).

⁸⁴ Central Africa Regional Program for the Environment, http://carpe.umd.edu/overview2004/history_2004.asp (last visited Mar. 29, 2006).

International Development (USAID) and specifically works in the Congo Basin, encompassing the Central African Republic, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Republic of Congo, Burundi, Cameroon, Democratic Republic of Congo, Rwanda, and Sao Tome & Principe.⁸⁵ CARPE works with range states and the NGO community to facilitate programs that support biodiversity protection; the largest of which is the Congo Basin Forest Partnership (CBFP).⁸⁶

CBFP was initiated in 2002 jointly by the United States and South Africa, along with 27 private and public organizations.⁸⁷ CBFP was launched with the intention to:

Promote economic development, poverty alleviation, improved governance, and natural resources conservation through support for a network of national parks and protected areas, well-managed forestry concessions, and assistance to communities who depend upon the conservation of the outstanding forest and wildlife resources of eleven key landscapes in six Central African countries.⁸⁸

The United States invested \$53 million during the first phase of operations (2003-2005) while numerous additional range states, non-range states, and NGOs donated matching funds through grants and in-kind support.⁸⁹ The second phase of CBFP has recently solicited proposals for the 11 landscapes based on a five year phase of operations (2006-2011) involving an estimated US\$45 million. Recommendations on expenditures, however, stipulate that at least 50% of these funds must be spent outside protected areas in the landscapes (*i.e.* be focused on development related activities).⁹⁰ While a focus on bushmeat monitoring is a stated priority action of the program it has not yet appeared as an item to be funded.

CBFP separates the forest region into eleven separate landscapes, many of which cross international boundaries.⁹¹ These landscapes “are of a sufficient size to capture the large home and seasonal ranges for focal species...and to maintain viable populations or wide-ranging and rare species.”⁹² These landscapes present an approach reminiscent of the North American model of wildlife conservation – along with the priority for capacity building of national governments and communities toward improved management of wildlife resources. As with the North American model, however, the first order of action must be to secure the wildlife resource and its base habitat. This must be followed by building effective capacity and funding for long-term support of those areas. The CBFP model has great potential for regions like Central Africa but it

⁸⁵ *Id.*

⁸⁶ The European Commission sponsors a similar project entitled Forest Law Enforcement, Governance, and Trade (FLEGT). For more information visit http://www.diplomatie.gouv.fr/en/france-priorities_1/environment-sustainable-development_1097. The United States, in addition to CBFP, sponsors the President’s Initiative Against Illegal Logging. For more information visit http://www.usaid.gov/about_usaid/presidential_initiative/logging.html.

⁸⁷ Central Africa Regional Program for the Environment, http://carpe.umd.edu/overview2004/cbfp_2004.asp (last visited Mar. 29, 2006).

⁸⁸ *Id.*

⁸⁹ U.S. Department of State, <http://www.state.gov/g/oes/rls/fs/2002/15617.htm> (last visited Jan. 5, 2006). The USDA Forest Service International Programs is active in helping with technical assistance in CBFP. For more information see <http://www.fs.fed.us/global/aboutus/policy/tt/illegal.htm>.

⁹⁰ See U.S. Agency for International Development Eastern and Central Africa, *Request for Applications No. 623-A-06-026* (on file with author).

⁹¹ Preliminary Assessment, *supra* note 9, at 17-28.

⁹² *Id.* at 16.

must be complemented by significant resource targeted at actual conservation activities. USAID has the mandate and expertise to provide development support that is linked with a specialized environmental focus. This program should be supported to execute that mandate but with a more balanced level of support for the essential complement of biodiversity conservation activities that exists parallel to such development initiatives.

D. International Conservation Caucus (ICC)

Members of the House of Representatives and Senate have created an opportunity for supporting this recommended US engagement in international conservation efforts. Members can join one of the largest, bi-partisan caucuses in Congress -- the International Conservation Caucus (ICC). The ICC was established in September 2003 and provides an opportunity for Members of Congress to come together, setting aside political differences, to focus on an issue of global concern. Biodiversity conservation transcends partisan politics. This is an excellent potential avenue for government support of the bushmeat crisis through the US-supported programs described. Unity on an issue of global importance with significant U.S. health and safety implications rises above the political arena. The mission of the ICC is the following:

The Members of the International Conservation Caucus share a conviction that the United States of America has the opportunity, the obligation and the interests to advance the conservation of natural resources for this and future generations. The mission of the Caucus is to act on this conviction by providing the strong U.S. leadership necessary to conserve the world's most biologically rich and diverse places.⁹³

There is no question that the ICC mission is well suited to support international biodiversity conservation – including the expert-identified cross-cutting priority issue of bushmeat. The ICC has the potential to prove vital in passing legislation and supporting key funding mechanisms that would help fulfill the directives of international agreements and materialize the key components for success evidenced by the North American model of wildlife conservation most relevant to addressing the bushmeat crisis in Central Africa. Legislation will remain strong only as long as there is long-term, dependable financial support available and the political interest to procure and distribute those resources accordingly remains potent. As of June 6, 2005 there were over 100 members of the ICC in the House.⁹⁴

Thus, the United States participates directly and in partnership with a number of funding and program mechanisms that are well-placed to prioritize the most important threat facing wildlife in the Congo Basin today. A coordinated effort to highlight this issue among key government institutions for a broad-based strategy to support the bushmeat crisis (through both increased technical and financial aid) within the U.S. government is called for. It is important to recognize that for FY2005 US\$ 18.8 million was spent on the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service international

⁹³ International Conservation Caucus, <http://www.royce.house.gov/internationalconservation/index.htm> (last visited Apr. 3, 2006).

⁹⁴ International Conservation Caucus, <http://www.royce.house.gov/internationalconservation/members.htm> (last visited Apr. 6, 2006).

conservation efforts through the Multinational Species Conservation Funds, Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Act and US Fish and Wildlife Service International Affairs (CITES, Wildlife Without Borders and other international efforts).⁹⁵ In contrast, the international development assistance budget for the U.S. Agency for International Development was US\$ 1.4 billion for FY2005.⁹⁶ This is a tremendous imbalance between US conservation and development commitments; an achievement gap has resulted and requires an adequate balance to successfully address the bushmeat crisis and achieve biodiversity conservation for generations to come. Such an effort, however, requires the support of international agreement regarding the prioritization of addressing the bushmeat crisis. Such agreements do exist.

VII. THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT AND INTERNATIONAL CONSERVATION AGREEMENTS

There are four key international conservation efforts that focus on issues of wildlife trade and biodiversity conservation around the world. The Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) focuses on international trade in endangered species. The Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) focuses on issues of biodiversity conservation within nations and having international significance but the US is not a signatory. The International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN) is an influential consortium of governments, non-government organizations, and scientists well known for listing species as either threatened or endangered. And a new initiative developed by the U.S. Department of State along with other US agencies, the Coalition Against Wildlife Trafficking (CAWT), aims to unite governments and the non-governmental sector to open constructive dialogue and create a global partnership that focuses efforts on the illegal wildlife trade with an initial focus in Asia. Each of these efforts offers important opportunities for addressing the bushmeat crisis in Central Africa and illegal wildlife trafficking around the globe.

A. CITES

The Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) is an “international agreement between governments with the aim to ensure that the international trade of wild animal and plants does not threaten their survival.”⁹⁷ CITES came into effect on July 1, 1975 with the support of 80 countries, including the United States, United Kingdom, South Africa, and Brazil.⁹⁸ The Convention places flora and fauna into various appendices, ranging from Appendix I, concerned with animals threatened with extinction, to Appendix III, dealing with species protected in at least one country.⁹⁹ Today, CITES has a membership of 169 parties¹⁰⁰ and has been influential in focusing on the trade in illegal elephant ivory, whales, and numerous other species as well as supporting international conservation initiatives throughout

⁹⁵ International Conservation, *supra* note 73. The International Affairs department handles the Multispecies Funds and Wildlife Without Borders program.

⁹⁶ United States Government FY2005 Appropriations, *available at* <http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/F?108:1:./temp/~c108Ex11bv:e513177>:

⁹⁷ CITES, <http://www.cites.org/eng/disc/what.shtml> (last visited Dec. 13, 2005).

⁹⁸ CITES, <http://www.cites.org/eng/disc/parties/chronolo.shtml> (last visited Dec. 13, 2005).

⁹⁹ CITES, <http://www.cites.org/eng/disc/how.shtml> (last visited Dec. 13, 2005).

¹⁰⁰ CITES, *supra* note 95.

the world. CITES is funded by the governments that are signatories. As a signatory, the United States plays an active role in funding CITES, with each member party contributing funds based on the U.N. contributions scale.¹⁰¹ The US has committed \$1,071,138 to CITES for 2006; approximately 22% of the total CITES funding.¹⁰²

Membership in CITES requires the joining party to fulfill a number of obligations. Management and scientific authorities are required to regulate trade and to document CITES implementation within the host country.¹⁰³ Parties are requested to attend biennial conferences and are required to: 1) confiscate smuggled goods, or 2) send the goods back to their country of origin, or 3) penalize the violators.¹⁰⁴ Enforcement is left up to the individual country and CITES can only be enforced by its individual members, with parties strongly urged to pass appropriate legislation.¹⁰⁵ This individualism leaves CITES implementation to the “national and political will” of member parties.¹⁰⁶

Recognizing that the unregulated bushmeat trade was threatening species survival throughout Africa, CITES created the Bushmeat Working Group (BWG) with the collective aim to “promote awareness and action to achieve better and sustainable management of the bushmeat trade.”¹⁰⁷ The CITES BWG was supported by funds from outside grants secured by the Bushmeat Crisis Task Force and UK-DEFRA for general operations and meetings for its first phase of operations (2002-2004). The group was officially mandated to continue operations for a second phase (2005-2007) but was unfortunately unsuccessful in securing funding for their proposal: *Proposal for a Second Phase in the Central African Sub-Region* in September 2004.¹⁰⁸ The second phase proposal supported an increase in anti-poaching units, creating collaborative frameworks including the private sector, civil society, and local community groups, and strengthening institutions to deal with trade; including information, education, and communication systems.¹⁰⁹ While the proposal was unsuccessful in finding funding there is still significant interest in the region that could support the implementation of the plan set forth by the CITES BWG. Although this agreement is linked with regulated international trade in endangered species the current international bushmeat trade does include endangered species that is illegal, undetected and unregulated mandating further CITES engagement and commitment.

B. Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD)

Another major multi-national conservation agreement, of which the United States is not a member, is the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), signed by 150 countries at the 1992 Rio Earth Summit, dedicating funds to the support of sustainable development.¹¹⁰ CBD has the ambitious goal “to achieve by 2010 a significant reduction of the current rate of biodiversity loss

¹⁰¹ SARAH FITZGERALD, INTERNATIONAL WILDLIFE TRADE: WHOSE BUSINESS IS IT? 355 (1989).

¹⁰² CITES, <http://www.cites.org/eng/disc/funds/CT.pdf> (last visited May 9, 2006).

¹⁰³ Fitzgerald, *supra* note 101, at 322.

¹⁰⁴ *Id.* at 355.

¹⁰⁵ *Id.* at 323. The United States implements CITES through the Endangered Species Act of 1973.

¹⁰⁶ GINETTE HEMLEY, ED., INTERNATIONAL WILDLIFE TRADE: A CITES SOURCE BOOK 5 (1994).

¹⁰⁷ CITES, <http://www.cites.org/eng/prog/bushmeat.shtml> (last visited Dec. 13, 2006).

¹⁰⁸ CITES Bushmeat Working Group, *supra* note 67.

¹⁰⁹ *Id.* at 4-5.

¹¹⁰ Convention on Biological Diversity, <http://www.biodiv.org/convention/default.shtml> (last visited Dec. 14, 2005).

at the global, regional and national level as a contribution to poverty alleviation and to the benefit of all life on earth.”¹¹¹ The convention receives funding from members and concerned parties, with money deposited in a number of trusts, with total revenues through 2006 expected to be \$3,487,989 (US).¹¹² Although not a member, the United States has pledged \$100,000 (US) to the CBD general fund for 2006.¹¹³ The CBD has been engaged peripherally in focusing on the bushmeat issue itself through the commissioned production of scientific reviews of the bushmeat crisis and the role of CBD but has not yet identified, developed, or implemented any significant effort with regards to the bushmeat trade in Africa. This agreement process should be further engaged with at least a reporting of countries linked with monitoring and evaluation of conservation outcomes as they are linked with the bushmeat trade.

C. IUCN

The International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN) unites 82 governments, 111 government agencies, more than 800 non-governmental organizations, and an estimated 10,000 scientists and experts from 181 countries in a “unique worldwide partnership”.¹¹⁴ The mission of the organization is “to influence, encourage and assist societies throughout the world to conserve the integrity and diversity of nature and to ensure that any use of natural resources is equitable and ecologically sustainable.”¹¹⁵ In 2002, the United States contributed approximately \$3,900,000 to the IUCN through the State Department and other U.S. agencies (6% of total IUCN contributions).¹¹⁶ The Union is currently involved in a program through 2008 that focuses on sustainable management of natural resources for long-term use, with a special emphasis on poorer communities.¹¹⁷ The IUCN also passed a Resolution regarding the bushmeat issue in 2000.¹¹⁸ Programs implementing the recommendations of the resolution have been linked to workshops to develop increased understanding and action planning for the bushmeat issue. IUCN offers an important focal point for the development of comprehensive bushmeat and wildlife trade activities in partnership with other organizations actively working in these areas. This includes linkages with important food security programs such as the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO). Most efforts that have emerged in the past decade have been disappointing in producing sufficient results in the areas of protein or income alternatives. The IUCN is extremely well-positioned with its network of scientists and experts, international linkages and networks with development to lead efforts to address targeted bushmeat projects throughout the region.

D. Coalition Against Wildlife Trafficking (CAWT)

¹¹¹ Convention on Biological Diversity, <http://www.biodiv.org/2010-target/default.asp> (last visited Dec. 14, 2005).

¹¹² Convention on Biological Diversity, <http://www.biodiv.org/world/parties.asp?tab=1&menu=home> (last visited Mar. 28, 2006). Much of this money remains unpaid as of March 28, 2006.

¹¹³ Convention on Biological Diversity, <http://www.biodiv.org/world/parties.asp?tab=1&fin=bya#us> (last visited Mar. 28, 2006). This is the first donation to the General Trust Fund by the United States.

¹¹⁴ IUCN, <http://www.iucn.org/en/about/index.htm> (last visited May 9, 2006).

¹¹⁵ *Id.*

¹¹⁶ IUCN, <http://www.iucn.org/en/about/finances.htm> (last visited May 9, 2006). The conversion rate from Swiss Francs to U.S. Dollars was made with 2006 calculations. The Swiss Franc amount of U.S. contributions in 2002 was 4,800,000.

¹¹⁷ IUCN, <http://www.iucn.org/en/about/index.htm> (last visited May 9, 2005).

¹¹⁸ See IUCN, 2.64 *The Unsustainable Commercial Trade in Wild Meat*, Wild Meat Resolution (2000).

The Coalition Against Wildlife Trafficking (CAWT) was initiated in 2005 by the U.S. Department of State after recognition of the negative impacts of illegal logging on international wildlife by G-8 leaders in July 2005.¹¹⁹ The CAWT initiative brings together various U.S. government agencies and other nations (currently UK and India have signed on) to address the illegal wildlife trade through a coordinated approach which focuses on effective information management, law enforcement and capacity building, and awareness raising.¹²⁰ As a forward thinking policy approach, CAWT is a model initiative for consideration by the US government in addressing world biodiversity and, specifically, the bushmeat crisis in Central Africa. CAWT has the possibility not only to help create solutions to the global issue of wildlife trade, but also help the U.S. look inward and create new policies that effectively combat the trade which takes place within its own borders.

In its initial focus, CAWT has selected wildlife trafficking in Asia as a priority. Efforts of CBFP, CITES, IUCN and others in Central Africa will provide helpful case study analysis as the CAWT initiative further expands. Intended as a global partnership of governments and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) as well as multiple agencies within government (e.g. USFWS, NOAA, DOJ), CAWT signals the type of leadership and initiative necessary to mobilize critical partnerships and encourage resource commitments to address unsustainable trafficking of wildlife impacting the global community.

Funding for these and related programs addressing international conservation is contingent on yearly government appropriations and has yet to reach the amount suggested by the International Conservation Budget consortium.¹²¹ That is, while all of these efforts play important roles in addressing goals toward biodiversity conservation, none are adequately funded nor are their impacts adequately monitored or evaluated. There needs to be increased financial resources and coordinated effort among US agencies and the agreements of which it is a part to effect greater achievement of biodiversity conservation goals linked with the bushmeat crisis. Realizing such goals is equally dependent upon range state leadership and commitment to biodiversity conservation.

VIII. RANGE STATE BIODIVERSITY COLLABORATION

Recognizing the need for a united, range state response to biodiversity loss – largely driven by the bushmeat crisis as well as habitat alteration due to logging and other development activities - Central African nations have joined together to support a number of important multi-national agreements and set the framework for successful future collaboration. The initial idea for CBFP developed as a result of the 1999 Yaoundé Declaration signed by the heads of six African nations, in which a framework was created to develop “new transboundary and regional conservation efforts.”¹²² This declaration established the formation of the Commission of

¹¹⁹ U.S. Department of State, <http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/53854.pdf> (last visited Feb. 2, 2006).

¹²⁰ *Id.* These U.S. agencies include the Departments of Interior, Justice, Agriculture, Homeland Security, and State.

¹²¹ The International Conservation Budget is a pamphlet produced by four major conservation organizations that suggest appropriate funding levels for international conservation programs.

¹²² Preliminary Assessment, *supra* note 9, at 1.

Ministers in charge of Forests in Central Africa (COMIFAC).¹²³ In December of 2000, COMIFAC members met and developed a Plan of Convergence, defining COMIFAC as “the only authority of orientation, decision and coordination of the sub-regional actions and initiatives as regards conservation and sustainable management of the forest ecosystems.”¹²⁴ In 2004, the organization changed its name to the Central African Forest Commission, keeping the initials COMIFAC.¹²⁵

In February 2005 the COMIFAC treaty was signed in Brazzaville, Republic of Congo.¹²⁶ At this meeting, the COMIFAC Plan of Convergence was agreed to, giving the commission its legal authority within the region.¹²⁷ “The Convergence Plan enables the states of Central Africa to have a common and shared vision of the conservation and the sustainable management of their ecosystems. The objective is to coordinate and to harmonize the intervention strategies of the various stakeholders of the sub-region.”¹²⁸ Members to this plan agree to include conservation of forests as a national priority, implement certification systems for wood products, institute sustainable development financing, foster inter-country cooperation, and develop transparent procedures for the trade in wildlife and forest products.¹²⁹ Funding for COMIFAC comes from member states but the plan allows for the acquisition of funds from international development organizations.¹³⁰

Another important African multi-national agreement is the Africa Forest Law Enforcement and Governance (AFLEG) ministerial declaration signed on October 16, 2003.¹³¹ The AFLEG declaration looks to strengthen good governance programs within Africa, identify economic alternatives to illegal forest activities, strengthen cooperation between member countries law enforcement agencies, and work with countries outside the declaration to foster and expand the goals of AFLEG.¹³² The “FLEG” process has also been initiated in Europe and Asia and is

¹²³ World Wildlife Fund, http://www.panda.org/about_wwf/where_we_work/africa/what_we_do/central_africa/yaounde_summit/q_and_a/index.cfm (last visited Jan. 7, 2006).

¹²⁴ Government of France, Foreign Affairs Ministry, http://www.diplomatie.gouv.fr/en/france-priorities_1/environment-sustainable-development_1097/brazzaville-summit-4-5-february-2005_2082/the-central-africa-forests-comifac_1637.html (last visited Mar. 18, 2006).

¹²⁵ *Id.*

¹²⁶ Government of France, Foreign Affairs Ministry, http://www.diplomatie.gouv.fr/en/france-priorities_1/environment-sustainable-development_1097/brazzaville-summit-4-5-february-2005_2082/the-context-and-the-issues-of-the-brazzaville-summit_1636.html (last visited Mar. 18, 2006).

¹²⁷ Government of France, Foreign Affairs Ministry, http://www.diplomatie.gouv.fr/en/france-priorities_1/environment-sustainable-development_1097/brazzaville-summit-4-5-february-2005_2082/the-sub-regional-convergence-plan_1646.html (last visited Mar. 18, 2006). This legal authority came 5 years after the formation of COMIFAC in 1999.

¹²⁸ *Id.*

¹²⁹ Treaty on the Conservation and Sustainable Management of Forest Ecosystems in Central Africa and to Establish the Central African Forests Commission (COMIFAC) 2005 available at http://www.cbfp.org/docs_gb/treaty-english.pdf (last visited Mar. 18, 2006).

¹³⁰ *Id.*

¹³¹ Africa Forest Law and Enforcement Governance Ministerial Conference, Ministerial Declaration, available at [http://www.cbfp.org/docs_gb/aflegt.pdf\(2003\)](http://www.cbfp.org/docs_gb/aflegt.pdf(2003)) (last visited Mar. 13, 2006).

¹³² *Id.*

supported by both producer and consumer nations.¹³³ The process hopes to address the “widespread failure of forest governance and law enforcement (that) directly undermines any nation’s attempt to achieve sustainable economic growth, societal equity, and environmental protection.”¹³⁴

What these agreements, and others like them, require is technical and financial support from donor nations to implement the comprehensive actions called for. For a multi-national agreement to be effective, it requires a stable government that can effectively represent the needs and desires of the people it represents. For instance, the Democratic Republic of Congo is a signatory to the AFLEG process¹³⁵ and the country is still in the midst of a transitional government after assassination of its leader in 2001.¹³⁶ This political uncertainty does not foster foreign investment or create an atmosphere conducive to successful conservation policy. Strong U.S. government leadership and investment in the Congo Basin will enhance the likelihood of extended political stability and increased democracy in the region.

These landmark regional agreements have received major support from the Congo Basin Forest Partnership efforts previously described. A forum for communications among nations and collaboration across borders to manage natural resources is emerging. Still, the bushmeat trade continues with trends suggesting there is already extirpation of species from some areas. There is a need for an immediate, targeted, coordinated response among global communities to support goals established by the Central Africa region’s key decision makers. There is a call to action to secure the necessary funding base and assure mechanisms for improved capacity and long-term management of the wildlife resource can be assured.

IX. CONCLUSION

The International Union of Concerned Scientists (IUCN) estimates that as of 2006, 23% of mammals, 53% of invertebrates, 70% of plants, and 40% of total evaluated species are threatened with the risk of extinction around the globe.¹³⁷ These numbers suggest that detailed *in situ* fieldwork needs to be bolstered by strong legislation, adequate funding and professional capacity that will broadly sweep across ecosystems regardless of international boundaries. For this to occur, forceful, fair leadership will have to emerge on the African continent, committed to biodiversity protection as a top government priority. This is unlikely to happen with only a handful of nations able to lead region-wide initiatives. The bushmeat crisis is a complex issue that Central African governments will not be able to address adequately without strong U.S. and international support.

¹³³ Forest Monitor, AFLEG Briefing Note, http://www.forestsmonitor.org/afleg/en/AFLEG_note_fm_en.pdf (last visited Mar. 30, 2006).

¹³⁴ Africa Forest Governance and Law Enforcement Conference, Planning Meeting, http://www.forestsmonitor.org/afleg/en/AFLEG_note_wb_en.pdf (last visited Mar. 30, 2006).

¹³⁵ Sustainable Developments, <http://www.iisd.ca/sd/sdyao/13oct.html> (last visited Mar. 30, 2006).

¹³⁶ World Fact Book, *supra* note 58.

¹³⁷ IUCN Red List of Threatened Species, <http://www.redlist.org/info/tables/table1.html> (last visited April 3, 2006).

The total value of the bushmeat trade of Central Africa has been estimated as high as \$50 million per year.¹³⁸ The bushmeat crisis can be attributed to a number of local factors that, without proper funding, will only continue to negatively affect biodiversity. Recognizing the inherent problems with localized park structures, the U.S. government helped institute CBFP, building on a landscape approach to ecosystem conservation. While this is surely a model with great potential it must be realized that there is no international or range state agreement strong enough or adequate funding available to enable necessary action to achieve both conservation and development goals. Without international collaboration to assure the necessary funding and capacity to address this crisis it is certain that many species will be lost. In order to attack the issues of disease, international safety, and good governance, hard decisions will have to be made. A country-by-country approach is not the answer simply because there is not time to bring every country up to a level playing field.

The North American Conservation Model highlights areas of important consideration and potential value in viewing the bushmeat crisis in Africa. This model involved a region-wide enabling of wildlife management through formation of protected areas and development of the wildlife profession. This system was supported by placing value on the living wildlife resource and the emergence of a wildlife industry that was further supported by a wealthy citizenry that could shift values on wildlife from ones of utilitarian to those of existence. This industry was further supported by funds made available through taxation and law enforcement and governance systems that were robust and which were further bolstered by the self-policing and governance of a democratic citizenry.

This model of wildlife management in North America has been contrasted with the current priorities and capacities of developing world governments and communities; not only in biodiversity best-practices, but in government transparency and financial management. Governments are hindered by lack of financial resources and capacity to effectively support or promote natural resource conservation while faced with mounting poverty and increasing human populations. Local communities are driven by immediate utilitarian needs for wildlife in an arena where there is no capacity for law enforcement and social systems are breaking down. The United States maintains a number of potential funding sources as well as conservation and development programs that – if funded to their full authorization and facilitated through a collaborative process - could offset many of the shortfalls currently facing Central African governments and their inability to adequately address the bushmeat crisis. Such funding and support is called for in the numerous multi-national regional agreements which have been signed to date and which prioritize addressing the bushmeat crisis through protected areas, provision of alternatives, adequate law enforcement, and capacity building.

To fend off the mass extinction of African flora and fauna, African leaders must be supported in their commitments to simultaneous conservation and development goals. African citizens must be empowered, engaged, and aware of the consequences of over-hunting. Development that is carried out in truly sustainable manner is essential for the poorest communities that are most dependent on the continued health and viability of the natural resource base their livelihoods

¹³⁸ Joanna Elliot, *Wildlife and Poverty Study: Phase One Report, Department of International Development*, (Oct. 31, 2001), available at <http://www.forestforum.org.uk/docs/WAP-Dec17-2pg-overview.doc> (last visited Dec. 15, 2005).

depend upon. Without international commitments and collaboration over the long term, Africa will not attain these lofty goals. Every day that these requirements are left outstanding another species looms closer to extinction. Without quick, decisive action the only elephants left will be the ones in our memory.