

# The African Bushmeat Crisis: A Case for Global Partnership

*Andrew E. Kohn\* and Heather E. Eves<sup>‡</sup>*

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION .....	247
II. THE BUSHMEAT CRISIS .....	248
III. FACTORS THAT MAKE THE BUSHMEAT ISSUE A U.S. AND A GLOBAL PRIORITY.....	250
A. Disease .....	250
B. Fostering Democracy .....	252
C. Economic Development .....	253
IV. UNITED STATES CONSERVATION HISTORY .....	254
V. WHY THE NORTH AMERICAN CONSERVATION MODEL WORKED COMPARED WITH THE CENTRAL AFRICAN CASE.....	255
VI. UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT INVOLVEMENT IN SUPPORTING INTERNATIONAL BIODIVERSITY CONSERVATION .....	259
A. Multinational Species Conservation Funds and Wildlife Without Borders .....	260
B. Global Environment Facility (GEF).....	261
C. CARPE and the Congo Basin Forest Partnership.....	262
D. International Conservation Caucus (ICC) .....	264
VII. THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT AND INTERNATIONAL CONSERVATION AGREEMENTS.....	265

---

\* Andrew E. Kohn is a third-year law student attending Vermont Law School. He has worked in Africa and spent time with various conservation organizations specifically dealing with African conservation, including the Bushmeat Crisis Task Force.

<sup>‡</sup> Heather E. Eves has directed the BCTF collaborative since 2000 and is a wildlife biologist who has studied and worked in Africa since 1985. She holds a Doctorate of Forestry and Environmental Studies. Her dissertation research included studies on the subsistence and commercial bushmeat trade in logging and non-logging communities of northern Congo (Brazzaville) and used a policy sciences approach to evaluate both field conservation efforts as well as the BCTF collaborative.

- A. Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora ..... 266
- B. Convention on Biological Diversity ..... 267
- C. International Union of Concerned Scientists..... 268
- D. Coalition Against Wildlife Trafficking ..... 269
- VIII. RANGE STATE BIODIVERSITY COLLABORATION ..... 270
- IX. CONCLUSION..... 273

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.<sup>1</sup>

## I. INTRODUCTION

Recently across Central Africa, an expanding commercial, unsustainable, and largely illegal hunting and trade in wildlife meat threatens countless wildlife populations and species.<sup>2</sup> Currently, multi-national agreements and government initiatives created to address the bushmeat crisis are unable to halt the extensive destruction to this area's unique biodiversity.<sup>3</sup> Although many of these agreements strongly support addressing the bushmeat crisis, they lack the resources and capacity to be fully implemented. Strong U.S. bipartisan commitment to a global partnership would enhance international biodiversity conservation efforts prioritizing the bushmeat crisis as the leading threat across the region. The bushmeat crisis extends far beyond Africa. It has the potential to directly impact Americans and global citizens through emerging disease transmission in the growing international trade. U.S. government commitments to support global democracy and international economic development are linked with the bushmeat trade, which is driven by poverty and lack of governance issues.

This note aims to define "bushmeat," explain why the bushmeat issue is now a crisis, and identify why it is of global concern and responsibility. This note uses 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 in North America are relevant and informative here. The note will then highlight current U.S. capacity in building and funding mechanisms supporting international conservation as well as domestic and international involvement in biodiversity agreements. After reviewing factors leading to successful wildlife management in the U.S., 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

---

<sup>1</sup> See 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/cd/fs/FSwestcentralCD.pdf>. Discussing general bushmeat issues in West and Central Africa.

<sup>2</sup> *Id.*

<sup>3</sup> See Heather E. Eves, *Chapter 9: The Bushmeat Trade in Africa: Conflict, Consensus, and Collaboration*, in *GAINING GROUND: IN PURSUIT OF ECOLOGICAL SUSTAINABILITY 6* (D.M. Lavigne ed., 2006).

in Central Africa.<sup>4</sup> 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 leader, the United States has the capacity and resources to play a key role in effectively addressing the crisis, including directing a global partnership.

## 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.”<sup>5</sup> While many developing countries establish national parks, some of these parks are “paper parks,” areas of land declared protected in official documents but lacking proper resources and enforcement capabilities on the ground.<sup>6</sup> Infrastructure development, increased private industry engagement and government-sponsored natural resource extraction (wood, oil, and minerals) lead to road extension in these remote, pristine forest environments.<sup>7</sup> These roads facilitate the commerce of animal products for both personal and commercial consumption.<sup>8</sup> Left unaddressed, the commercial bushmeat trade in Africa will decimate wildlife populations in the vast majority of natural areas within the next few years.<sup>9</sup>

Bushmeat (the trade focused primarily on supplying food demands) applies to all wildlife species, including many 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.<sup>10</sup> The primary driving force enabling support for commercial bushmeat trade

<sup>4</sup> Eves, *supra* note 1.

<sup>5</sup> Wildlife Conservation Society, Hunting and Wildlife Trade Program, <http://www.wcs.org/international/huntingandwildlifetrade> (last visited Dec. 1, 2005).

<sup>6</sup> BUSHMEAT CRISIS TASK FORCE, WHAT IS THE BUSHMEAT CRISIS AND WHY IS IT IMPORTANT TO FOREST MANAGEMENT AND BIODIVERSITY CONSERVATION?, available at <http://www.bushmeat.org/cd/fs/BCTFBRIE.pdf>.

<sup>7</sup> BUSHMEAT CRISIS TASK FORCE, BCTF FACT SHEET: THE ROLE OF THE LOGGING INDUSTRY (2000), available at <http://www.bushmeat.org/cd/fs/FSlogging.PDF>.

<sup>8</sup> *Id.*

<sup>9</sup> BUSHMEAT CRISIS TASK FORCE, WHAT IS THE BUSHMEAT CRISIS?, *supra* note 6.

<sup>10</sup> 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> (last updated Feb. 22, 2007).

expansion is amplified commercial logging.<sup>11</sup> With a roadway infrastructure linking forests and hunters to consumers, there is a direct connection between devastating commercial bushmeat trade, logging and other extractive activities.

The Congo Basin is an important local and global resource. It maintains the second-largest dense humid tropical forest in the world, including 70% of Africa's remaining rainforests, second only to the Amazon Basin.<sup>12</sup> The Congo Basin forest of Central Africa has over 400 mammal species, 1,000 bird species, and over 10,000 plant species (of which some 3,000 are endemic).<sup>13</sup> The forest of the Congo Basin encapsulates the greatest variety of flora and fauna in Africa.<sup>14</sup> The forest holds half of the continent's wild species and is a natural and economic resource supporting 83 million people.<sup>15</sup>

In the Congo Basin of Central Africa, the bushmeat trade is, on average, six times the sustainable rate.<sup>16</sup> It is depleting the local wildlife with unprecedented speed. This loss of wildlife threatens the livelihoods, food security, and cultural practices of indigenous and rural populations most dependent on it,<sup>17</sup> which makes the bushmeat crisis both an ecological and human tragedy.

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 predicts an increase in the world population from 6.5 billion to 9.1 billion by the year 2050. Every twenty minutes the human population grows by 3,000 people and another plant or animal becomes extinct.<sup>18</sup>

The vast majority of this population expansion, an estimated 95%, occurs in the developing world.<sup>19</sup> Unfortunately, the countries with the greatest threats to

<sup>11</sup> See Susan Minnemeyer et al., AN ANALYSIS OF ACCESS TO CENTRAL AFRICA'S RAINFORESTS, (Karen Holmes, ed., Global Forest Watch Congo Basin Forestry and World Resources Institute 2002), for a general discussion of commercial logging expansion.

<sup>12</sup> The Jane Goodall Institute, [http://www.janegoodall.com/chimps/chimps\\_bushmeat\\_b.html](http://www.janegoodall.com/chimps/chimps_bushmeat_b.html) (last visited Feb. 4, 2006).

<sup>13</sup> THE CONGO BASIN FOREST PARTNERSHIP, THE FORESTS OF THE CONGO BASIN: A PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT 4 (2005), available at [http://carpe.umd.edu/resources/Documents/focb\\_aprelimassess\\_en.pdf](http://carpe.umd.edu/resources/Documents/focb_aprelimassess_en.pdf) (last visited May 1, 2006).

<sup>14</sup> *Id.*

<sup>15</sup> See THE WORLD BANK, TOTAL POPULATION PROJECTIONS, available at <http://devdata.worldbank.org/hnpstats/HNPDemographic/total.pdf> (last visited Sept. 12, 2006).

<sup>16</sup> 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).

<sup>17</sup> See generally Rebecca Hardin & Melissa J. Remis, *Biological and Cultural Anthropology of a Changing Tropical Forest: A Fruitful Collaboration Across Subfields*, 108 AMERICAN ANTHROPOLOGIST 273 (2006).

<sup>18</sup> Germany World Population Fund, Frequently Asked Questions, <http://www.overpopulation.org/faq.html> (last visited Apr. 6, 2006).

<sup>19</sup> Eves, *supra* note 1.

biodiversity are those with extreme population growth.<sup>20</sup> In addition, these countries have governments that often cannot meet the needs of existing populations, much less expanding ones.<sup>21</sup> Creative solutions to best practices of land use and wildlife management policies in such a challenging environment requires a coordinated effort and action planning. Such an effort must engage the broader global community, range state governments, private industry, and local communities. In addition, support by a collaborative plan and technical and financial resources is necessary for these efforts 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 predicted effect 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 predicted effect revolves around the desire to expand democracy and good governance practices across the globe for improved natural resources 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 may lead to the re-introduction, or sometimes the introduction, of law and order in volatile regions. The third predicted effect is to encourage responsible economic development by promoting and nurturing stable natural environments.

#### 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.<sup>22</sup> In June 2003, a monkeypox outbreak occurred in the United States after people interacted with infected animals previously housed with imported rodents from Africa.<sup>23</sup> Monkeypox is a virus that originates in

---

<sup>20</sup> See UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK FOR AFRICA (Feb. 24, 2006), available at [http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf\\_docs/PDACG573.pdf](http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PDACG573.pdf). This USAID report details the goals for U.S. programs and their implementation in sub-Saharan Africa.

<sup>21</sup> *Id.*

<sup>22</sup> BUSHMEAT CRISIS TASK FORCE, BCTF FACT SHEET: GLOBAL HUMAN HEALTH (June 2003), available at <http://www.bushmeat.org/cd/fs/FShealth.pdf>. Although Avian Flu is not mentioned specifically in the fact sheet, the name itself suggests its origin.

<sup>23</sup> CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL AND PREVENTION, FACT SHEET: WHAT YOU SHOULD KNOW ABOUT MONKEYPOX (June 12, 2003), available at <http://www.cdc.gov/ncidod/monkeypox/pdf/factsheet2.pdf>. These prairie dogs were purchased as pets in the United States.

Central and West Africa and infects squirrels, rats, mice, and rabbits.<sup>24</sup> Ebola outbreaks in African communities, originating from an unknown source, occur repeatedly in Central Africa and often follow the consumption of bushmeat.<sup>25</sup> In one instance, a hunting party of fifteen in Gabon came across a dead silverback gorilla that they butchered, cooked, and ate.<sup>26</sup> Within a few weeks, there were only two survivors – the gorilla had died from Ebola and transmitted the virus to the humans.<sup>27</sup>

One current belief is that bushmeat is the most likely vector for the HIV/AIDS pandemic.<sup>28</sup> A similar virus, Simian Immunodeficiency Virus (SIV), occurs in chimpanzees and sooty mangabeys.<sup>29</sup> When exposed to infected animals, hunters provide a vector for the successful mutation of SIV into HIV.<sup>30</sup> Potential linkages between wildlife and health prompted emerging collaborative efforts, which address the threats not only to humans but also to other domestic animals and wildlife in nations trading bushmeat, including the US.<sup>31</sup>

These exotic viruses are not the only wildlife-borne illnesses recently making headlines. Avian influenza (AI), or the avian flu, is highly contagious and easily spreads from wild migrating birds to domestic poultry populations.<sup>32</sup> Infected birds spread AI through “their saliva, nasal secretions, and feces” leaving the virus behind when they have left the scene.<sup>33</sup> The possibility of domestic animal stock infection, as well as human infection, increases dramatically when animals are removed from their natural habitats.<sup>34</sup> The bushmeat implications are obvious: a hunter kills a wild, infected bird and brings it home for dinner, potentially exposing his own animals to AI. Recent research suggests that the 1918 Spanish Flu pandemic, killing approximately 20 million people worldwide,

---

<sup>24</sup> *Id.*

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

<sup>26</sup> Dale Peterson, *EATING APES* 80-81 (University of California Press 2003).

<sup>27</sup> *Id.*

<sup>28</sup> Beatrice H. Hahn et al., *AIDS as a Zoonosis: Scientific and Public Health Implications*, 287 *SCI.* 537, 607 (Jan. 2000).

<sup>29</sup> BUSHMEAT CRISIS TASK FORCE, BCTF FACT SHEET: GLOBAL HUMAN HEALTH, *supra* note 22.

<sup>30</sup> ENVIRONMENTAL AND ENERGY STUDY INSTITUTE, “BUSHMEAT” AND THE ORIGIN OF HIV/AIDS: A CASE STUDY OF BIODIVERSITY, POPULATION PRESSURES, AND HUMAN HEALTH (Feb. 2002), available at <http://www.eesi.org/publications/02.19.02bushmeat.pdf>.

<sup>31</sup> Emma Marris, *Bushmeat Surveyed in Western Cities*, *NATURE ONLINE* (June 2006), available at <http://www.nature.com/news/2006/060626/pdf/060626-10.pdf>.

<sup>32</sup> CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL AND PREVENTION, FACT SHEET: AVIAN INFLUENZA, (June 30, 2006) available at [http://www.cdc.gov/flu/avian/gen-info/pdf/avian\\_facts.pdf](http://www.cdc.gov/flu/avian/gen-info/pdf/avian_facts.pdf).

<sup>33</sup> *Id.*

<sup>34</sup> The University of Georgia, College of Veterinary Medicine, *Wildlife and Wildlife Associated Diseases of Livestock* <http://www.vet.uga.edu/vpp/IVM/ENG/Global/wildlife.htm> (last visited Mar. 28, 2007).

was originally a form of avian flu.<sup>35</sup> Avian flu now occurs in Africa and the potential losses of wild and domestic bird consumption puts increased pressure on wildlife species for bushmeat.<sup>36</sup> With the extensive international markets actively trading bushmeat from Africa throughout Europe and the U.S.,<sup>37</sup> it is only a matter of time before disease will impact U.S. wildlife, domestic animals, or citizens.

### B. Fostering Democracy

Fair distribution of natural resource products and revenues within range states will foster government transparency.<sup>38</sup> In addition, it will allow the general populace to witness first-hand the usefulness of protecting national biodiversity and natural resources.<sup>39</sup> Many Africans live in abject poverty while those with wealth continue to accrue it at the expense of the populace.<sup>40</sup> Leaders can come into office with the opportunity to control natural resource extraction without public benefit.<sup>41</sup> Mismanagement of natural resources and the profits therein only foster a desire by the “haves” to have more and resentment of those in power by the “have-nots.” The inability to take ownership and control of valuable natural resources makes people feel “cheated of their right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, cheated out of their enjoyment of the earth and all it contains.”<sup>42</sup> A negative view of wildlife by indigenous peoples is inevitable under the current framework in many nations because “wildlife becomes a symbol of detested privilege and power.”<sup>43</sup>

These sentiments regarding natural resource use and benefits underscore larger issues of governance that plague Africa. World Bank President, Paul Wolfowitz, described good governance as:

essentially the combination of transparent and accountable institutions, strong skills and competence, and a fundamental willingness to do the right

<sup>35</sup> *Avian Flu*, YALE GLOBAL ONLINE, <http://yaleglobal.yale.edu/reports/avianflu.jsp> (last visited Mar. 28, 2006).

<sup>36</sup> 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>.

<sup>37</sup> Marris, *supra* note 31.

<sup>38</sup> Nicholas P. Lapham, *A Natural Resource Conservation Initiative for Africa*, in RISING U.S. STAKES IN AFRICA: SEVEN PROPOSAL TO STRENGTHEN U.S.-AFRICA POLICY 88, 96 (J. Stephen Morrison ed., 2004).

<sup>39</sup> *Id.*

<sup>40</sup> *Id.*

<sup>41</sup> *Id.*

<sup>42</sup> *Id.* at 94. This quote can be found in *Breaking New Ground* by Gifford Pinchot, first published in 1947.

<sup>43</sup> Valerius Geist, *How Markets in Wildlife Meat and Parts, and the Sale of Hunting Privileges, Jeopardize Wildlife Conservation*, 2 CONSERVATION BIOLOGY 15, 22 (1988).



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.<sup>44</sup>

Democratic use and management of wildlife is highly dependent on good governance practices that are still emerging in much of Central Africa.

There were many attempts over the last two decades throughout Africa to integrate conservation and development goals in projects through increased participation by local communities.<sup>45</sup> However, most of these efforts failed to achieve success, particularly in stated conservation goals.<sup>46</sup> The increased involvement of local communities in land-use planning activities is critically important to long-term resource management but it is challenged by extreme poverty.<sup>47</sup> Such programs will be successful only in conjunction with a framework of improved governance structures, mechanisms, and capacities.

### 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.”<sup>48</sup> For economic development to be successful, management of natural resources with the goal of long-term sustainability is important. Unfortunately, this is not the case through much of Africa. Lumping together poverty alleviation and biodiversity conservation in programs meant to address economic disparities in developing countries often results in neither receiving equal attention.<sup>49</sup> Often, the association of biodiversity with the broader term “nature” simplifies the concept into a one-word definition that is easily affixed to poverty alleviation programs.<sup>50</sup> Biodiversity, however, is a complex term and without addressing its components directly, poverty alleviation is attempted at the expense of responsible natural

---

<sup>44</sup> Paul Wolfowitz, President, World Bank Group, Address Given in Jakarta, Indonesia: Good Governance and Development: A Time for Action (Apr. 11, 2006), available at [www.worldbank.org](http://www.worldbank.org) (follow link to “Statements,” then “Speeches,” then search by date).

<sup>45</sup> Arun Agrawal & Kent Redford, *Poverty, Development, and Biodiversity Conservation: Shooting in the Dark?* (Wildlife Conservation Society, Working Paper No. 26, 2006) (on file with author).

<sup>46</sup> *Id.*

<sup>47</sup> 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).

<sup>48</sup> David Quammen, *Tracing the Human Footprint*, NATIONAL GEOGRAPHIC, Sept. 2005, at 20 (quoting Mike Fay, Wildlife Conservation Society scientist and participant of the Mega-Flyover project).

<sup>49</sup> Agrawal & Redford, *supra* note 45, at 2.

<sup>50</sup> *Id.* at 12.

resource management practices.<sup>51</sup> This is particularly true where wildlife is concerned.<sup>52</sup> The ultimate result will be an eroded natural resource base keeping the poorest communities from the faculties to meet basic needs.

In reality, the assumption that both biodiversity conservation and poverty alleviation is achievable in one program is mistaken. Failure will occur unless conservation organizations and development entities have the resources and mandate them fully to utilize their unique skill sets and work in cooperation. The current climate of competition (*i.e.* choices made to meet this generation's immediate needs at the expense of future generations' needs) makes this difficult.

Human population densities in West Africa are 4-5 times higher than those in Central Africa.<sup>53</sup> This population explosion places incredible strain on the local environment. Additionally, in these locations local wildlife extinction occurs across broad areas due to bushmeat hunting and loss of habitat.<sup>54</sup> Attempts to alleviate poverty in the region have directly led to the collapse of biodiversity. The same road that allows market access to induce poverty alleviation, create avenues into the forests for biodiversity extraction.<sup>55</sup>

The bushmeat crisis is a critically important modern-day challenge for both African and global citizens. Each maintains a variety of values attached to these Central African wildlife resources. Meanwhile, immediate economic, health, and land-use issues hinder the ability of technical experts, low-capacity government institutions, and poverty-laden local communities to adequately address the crisis.<sup>56</sup> It is important to identify other models of successful wildlife conservation and any components of those models 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 in a comprehensive conservation effort.<sup>57</sup> Pelican Island signaled the beginning of the North

---

<sup>51</sup> Eves, *supra* note 1.

<sup>52</sup> *Id.*

<sup>53</sup> BUSHMEAT CRISIS TASK FORCE, WHAT IS THE BUSHMEAT CRISIS AND WHY IS IT IMPORTANT TO FOREST MANAGEMENT AND BIODIVERSITY CONSERVATION?, *supra* note 6.

<sup>54</sup> *Id.*

<sup>55</sup> David Wilkie et al, *Roads, Development, and Conservation in the Congo Basin*, 14 *Conservation Biology* 1614, 1614-1622 (2000).

<sup>56</sup> This fact is highlighted by the various projects and programs currently being implemented in the region. For more information and specific examples, see generally The World Bank (<http://www.worldbank.org/>), the Global Environment Facility (<http://www.gefweb.org/>), and the USAID (<http://www.usaid.gov/>) project databases.

<sup>57</sup> Ruth Musgrave, *Federal Wildlife Law of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century*, in *FEDERAL WILDLIFE & RELATED LAW* (1998), available at <http://www.animallaw.info/articles/arusfedwildhistory.htm> (last visited

American wildlife conservation model, underscored in 1916 with the National Park Service Act.<sup>58</sup> The North American model of wildlife conservation succeeded 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.<sup>59</sup> These basic tenets of the U.S. model established a formal profession for wildlife management supporting 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.<sup>60</sup> Decimated by hunting for tongue and hide, this population was saved from the brink of extinction by a collection of elite hunters and capitalists.<sup>61</sup> These elite hunters and capitalists joined together to form the American Bison Society.<sup>62</sup> Today, bison are the keystone species of a United States wildlife industry that grosses approximately \$60 billion annually, placing value on enjoyment of living wildlife.<sup>63</sup> The key to this success was the shift from private use to public ownership of wildlife with recognition that private control decreases its economic return.<sup>64</sup> Additionally, closure of wildlife markets and valuing living wildlife resources over dead wildlife resources were cornerstones of the North American model of wildlife conservation.<sup>65</sup>

#### 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.<sup>66</sup> First, planning for the effective recovery of wildlife occurred on a continent-wide basis.<sup>67</sup> Management of wildlife

---

Dec. 17, 2005).

<sup>58</sup> *Id.*

<sup>59</sup> Geist, *supra* note 43, at 15-16.

<sup>60</sup> ANDREW ISENBERG, *THE DESTRUCTION OF THE BISON* 12 (2000).

<sup>61</sup> *Id.* at 166.

<sup>62</sup> *Id.*

<sup>63</sup> Geist, *supra* note 43, at 15.

<sup>64</sup> *Id.* at 16.

<sup>65</sup> *See generally id.* (Able to secure alternate food supplies, North American wildlife conservation was able to portray wildlife as a symbol of national pride to be protected as a lifeline to our cultural and historical past.).

<sup>66</sup> With increased assistance, a regional approach may develop that reflects the successes of the North American Conservation Model.

<sup>67</sup> Valerius Geist, *The North American Model of Wildlife Conservation as Means of Creating*

migration across landscapes was relatively easy in North America. With such an expansive area, the U.S. government could take large uninhabited areas in the early twentieth century and reserve them for wildlife.<sup>68</sup> Most modern-day citizens, therefore, are familiar with the concept of areas reserved for wildlife.

Citizen recognition of wild lands is commonplace in the U.S. today. There is a potential parallel between U.S. wildlife management history and Africa's current situation involving indigenous communities and land-use rights. The Native American nations have a long history of land-use negotiations in the U.S. that have evolved into relationships of true partnership.<sup>69</sup> The development of indigenous land use rights following private industry exploitation and government land use control is still very much in its infancy.<sup>70</sup> This trend potentially parallels current trends in Africa. Across much of Africa there have emerged many programs in recent decades that engage participation of local communities in wildlife management processes.<sup>71</sup> Unfortunately, many of these programs are still unsuccessful due largely to massive poverty that disables citizens from making decisions motivated by a priority for conservation.<sup>72</sup> Meeting immediate nutritional and economic needs through natural resource exploitation is the priority for most in this environment of extreme poverty without alternatives or opportunities.<sup>73</sup> Thus, the success of U.S.-style wildlife management continent-wide appears unlikely in Africa.

The second primary factor behind the success of wildlife management in the U.S. is the industry of wildlife.<sup>74</sup> This industry provides both economic wealth and employment based on the living wildlife resource.<sup>75</sup> It is supported by overall wealth of the average citizen in North America and enables a largely middle-class working population to vacation outside of urban environments. Such a large middle class is absent in much of Africa. The U.S. GDP per capita is \$40,100,<sup>76</sup> while in Kenya it is \$1,100,<sup>77</sup> and in the Democratic Republic of

---

*Wealth, Protecting Public Health while Generating Wildlife Biodiversity*, in GAINING GROUND: IN PURSUIT OF ECOLOGICAL SUSTAINABILITY 285, 287 (D.M. Lavigne ed., 2006).

<sup>68</sup> For an example of U.S. Congressional action view the act establishing Yellowstone as the first national park. Forty-Second Congress, Session II Ch. 21-24. 1872. March 1, 1872. CHAP. XXIV. -- *An Act to set apart a certain Tract of Land lying near the Head-waters of the Yellowstone River as a public Park.*

<sup>69</sup> The Native American Policy of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (1994) (on file with author).

<sup>70</sup> Eves, *supra* note 1.

<sup>71</sup> *Id.*

<sup>72</sup> *Id.*

<sup>73</sup> For information on global nutrition see generally BREAD FOR THE WORLD, HUNGER FACTS: INTERNATIONAL, <http://www.bread.org/learn/hunger-basics/hunger-facts-international.html>.

<sup>74</sup> Geist, *supra* note 43.

<sup>75</sup> *Id.*

<sup>76</sup> U. S. CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY, WORLD FACT BOOK: UNITED STATES, at <http://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook/geos/us.html> (last visited Dec. 21, 2005).

Congo it is \$700.<sup>78</sup> In this respect, it appears that consumers of the wildlife industry are not as available in Africa.

Furthermore, in Central Africa, there are limited opportunities for wildlife tourism on the scale present in countries like Kenya and South Africa. These countries obtain a dominant percentage of foreign currency earnings through this wildlife-based industry.<sup>79</sup> The infrastructure, field conditions, and language barriers present in Central Africa limit eco-tourism by many foreign tourists.<sup>80</sup> This in turn minimizes the positive impacts that such wildlife industry revenues might have in encouraging local communities to place higher value on living wildlife. Currently, there are only limited examples of local communities accumulating wealth from wildlife industry development and sport hunting, which is still in its infancy.<sup>81</sup>

A third factor in the success of U.S. wildlife management is a great public involvement.<sup>82</sup> North American populations engage in a number of activities linked with wildlife including zoo visitation, hunting, camping, hiking, photography and many others.<sup>83</sup> Currently, the Association of Zoos and Aquariums (AZA)-accredited institutions in the U.S. annually receive more than 142 million visitors.<sup>84</sup> This is more than all major sporting events combined.<sup>85</sup> Valuing wildlife by the majority of the U.S. population occurs mostly because of an appreciation of the intrinsic value of wildlife and less so because of utilitarian views.

The average citizen in both urban and rural areas of Central Africa has a largely utilitarian view of wildlife – the basic nutritional and economic benefits

---

<sup>77</sup> U. S. CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY, *WORLD FACT BOOK: KENYA*, at <http://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook/geos/ke.html> (last visited Dec. 21, 2005).

<sup>78</sup> U. S. CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY, *WORLD FACT BOOK: DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF CONGO*, at <http://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook/geos/cg.html> (last visited Apr. 6, 2006).

<sup>79</sup> "The state-run Kenya Tourism Board (KTB) said the industry would bring in \$780mn by year's end, up from \$648mn last year, buoyed by higher visitor arrivals." *Business in Africa, Kenya Eyes Record \$800mn Tourism Revenue* (Nov. 2006) available at [http://www.businessin africa.net/news/east\\_africa/989559.htm](http://www.businessin africa.net/news/east_africa/989559.htm).

<sup>80</sup> John G. Robinson, Senior Vice President and Director; International Conservation, The Wildlife Conservation Society, Remarks at Ecotourism Symposium: Ecotourism in the Congo Basin (Feb. 21, 2003).

<sup>81</sup> See L. Usongo & B.T. Nkanje, *Participatory approaches toward forest conservation: The case of Lobeke National Park, South east Cameroon*, 11 *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT AND WORLD ECOLOGY* 2 (2004). This article highlights the development of a unique partnership between local communities and the private sector for management of local resources in Lobeke National Park.

<sup>82</sup> Geist, *supra* note 43.

<sup>83</sup> For more information on activities that involve wildlife in North America visit the clearinghouse website <http://www.wildernet.com/>.

<sup>84</sup> American Zoological Association, *The Collective Impact of America's Zoos & Aquariums*, <http://www.aza.org/AboutAZA/CollectiveImpact1/> (last visited July 8, 2006).

<sup>85</sup> *Id.*

derived from the wildlife resource.<sup>86</sup> In contrast, demands for wildlife conservation by global citizenry derive from values of ecosystem services and option to use, continued existence, and bequest for future generations.<sup>87</sup> Such a disparity of wealth and values suggests that the costs of conservation should be financially supported by the global community and largely by governments, particularly because the costs of long term wildlife presence are largely born by local communities while an external global citizenry promotes these aesthetic values.<sup>88</sup>

A fourth factor of successful wildlife management in the United States is that citizens impose taxes upon themselves to support wildlife, beginning with the American Game Conference in 1930.<sup>89</sup> Revenues generated from such taxation fund wildlife conservation programs and enable the emergence of a strong wildlife profession.<sup>90</sup> Because of the relatively low-income levels in many African countries, a tax for wildlife is impracticable. This is because the very real concern of finding enough food for one's family still exists. Responsible investment and management of funds are necessary for the continued existence of wildlife in Africa; these funds must come largely from the global community.<sup>91</sup>

Fifth, the United States concerned itself with habitat conservation and then enforced this conservation through law.<sup>92</sup> Considerable legislation already exists across Central Africa restricting hunting activities including the bushmeat trade.<sup>93</sup> However, African countries lack the resources and political will to fund adequate law enforcement efforts in national parks and reserves.<sup>94</sup> Often, an individual in Africa can make better money working as a poacher than as a park ranger.<sup>95</sup> Regional approaches to conservation look to involve the community and use local populations to manage local resources but this likely requires

---

<sup>86</sup> *Id.*

<sup>87</sup> See A. Balmford & T. Whitten, *Who should pay for tropical conservation and how could the costs be met?*, 37 *ORYX* 238 (2003). Describing the funding gap the currently exists between what is given and what is actually required in tropical conservation.

<sup>88</sup> *See id.*

<sup>89</sup> Geist, *supra* note 43.

<sup>90</sup> The Federal Duck Stamp Program is a great example of successful taxation. For more information on the programs visit <http://www.fws.gov/duckstamps/Info/Stamps/stampinfo.htm>.

<sup>91</sup> Balmford & Whitten, *supra* note 87.

<sup>92</sup> Geist, *supra* note 43.

<sup>93</sup> Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Flora & Fauna, 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).

<sup>94</sup> *Id.*

<sup>95</sup> Peterson, *supra* note 26, 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.").

continued law enforcement components.

Finally, enforcement of conservation laws “is normally a remarkably civil affair” in North America with “much self-policing involved.”<sup>96</sup> 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.<sup>97</sup> 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.<sup>98</sup>

Is there an opportunity for any 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, enabling an environment for conservation and development to succeed 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 financially and technically by developed countries. Even so, a number of mechanisms are needed to encourage the emergence of such components in both 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 a collaborative approach to address the preservation of Central African biodiversity. There are four major government-supported programs that could contribute to this objective: (1) the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) 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. These programs laid the groundwork for comprehensive U.S. involvement in biodiversity conservation in African and the Congo Basin. However, they require continued government support and improved balance between conservation and development activities

---

<sup>96</sup> Geist, *supra* note 43.

<sup>97</sup> See BUSHMEAT CRISIS TASK FORCE, BCTF PHASE I REPORT 2000-2004, available at <http://www.bushmeat.org/cd/report/report.pdf> (last visited July 26, 2006). Describing BCTF Phase I accomplishments, and problems still to be addressed, from operations during 2000-2004.

<sup>98</sup> *Id.*

to make them viable long-term programs. Addressing the bushmeat crisis effectively requires the commitment of donor nations through such programs well into the foreseeable future.

*A. Multinational Species Conservation Funds and Wildlife Without Borders*

The USFWS administered Multinational Species Conservation Funds is supported by government appropriations for programs.<sup>99</sup> These programs focused on bi-lateral support for capacity building and conservation of African and Asian elephant, ape, marine turtle, rhinoceros, and tiger populations worldwide.<sup>100</sup> These programs were introduced beginning with the African Elephant Conservation Fund (1998) to the most recent Marine Turtle Conservation Fund (2005).<sup>101</sup> Although most of the funds carry an authorization of up to \$5 million USD, most allocations are far less. Through fiscal year 2005, federal funding for all the species conservation funds was \$36,785,376.<sup>102</sup> For fiscal year 2006, the government appropriated \$6.5 million to the various funds.<sup>103</sup> While this funding is commendable, the majority of actual project funding comes from non-government organization matching grants reaching \$100,559,683 through fiscal year 2005.<sup>104</sup> These combined funds significantly prevent what would otherwise be a massive negative impact on wildlife globally. Although they are not earmarked for the bushmeat crisis per se, the activities they support help to minimize impacts of illegal hunting and trade.<sup>105</sup> Funding at the current full authorization would dramatically impact efforts on the ground. These funds can also link together the specialized expertise of wildlife and habitat managers across nations to dramatically enhance conservation outcomes.<sup>106</sup>

---

<sup>99</sup> U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Wildlife Without Borders Species Programs, <http://www.fws.gov/international/dicprograms/speciesprogram.htm> (last visited Jan. 5, 2006).

<sup>100</sup> *Id.*

<sup>101</sup> *Id.*

<sup>102</sup> U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Wildlife Without Borders Multinational Species Conservation Funds History, [http://www.fws.gov/international/pdf/multi\\_funds\\_history\\_jan\\_06.pdf](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>.

<sup>103</sup> 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.

<sup>104</sup> U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, *supra* note 102.

<sup>105</sup> This is evident by the simple fact that more presence on the ground results in more vigilant attention to negative environmental impacts.

<sup>106</sup> Communication allows for multi-national support of various programs.



WWB Africa is a program also located within the USFWS Division of International Conservation.<sup>107</sup> The program aims to “strengthen resource management within Africa by providing capacity building opportunities for African conservationists and training institutions”<sup>108</sup> Through capacity building, the program hopes to address issues including the bushmeat crisis and wildlife disease.<sup>109</sup> WWB-Africa, launched in 2006, joined a host of other regional programs including those in Latin America, China, and India.<sup>110</sup> This program has the potential to provide an important complement to the Multinational Species Conservation Funds, linking bushmeat, disease, human and wildlife conflict issues, and capacity building, such as building the wildlife profession internationally. Allocation of funds to this program for Central Africa should be on the order of tens of millions rather than hundreds of thousands of dollars annually.

### B. *Global Environment Facility (GEF)*

The Global Environment Facility (GEF), founded in 1991, helps “developing countries fund projects and programs that protect the global environment.”<sup>111</sup> GEF funding supports projects in six distinct areas: biodiversity, climate change, international waters, land degradation, the ozone layer, and persistent organic pollutants.<sup>112</sup> The United States became a member of GEF on June 24, 1994.<sup>113</sup> GEF receives funding every four years through a process known as “GEF Replenishment,” with 32 members contributing \$3 billion USD for the period 2002-2006.<sup>114</sup> For the fiscal year 2006, the United States pledged \$80 million to GEF.<sup>115</sup> While biodiversity is one of six areas supported by GEF, a search for “bushmeat” in GEF projects database from 1991-2006 returns no results.<sup>116</sup>

<sup>107</sup> U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, *Wildlife Without Borders Africa Program*, [http://www.fws.gov/international/dicprograms/africa\\_program.html](http://www.fws.gov/international/dicprograms/africa_program.html) (last visited Mar. 28, 2007).

<sup>108</sup> *Id.*

<sup>109</sup> *Id.*

<sup>110</sup> U. S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE, *WILDLIFE WITHOUT BORDERS REGIONAL PROGRAMS*, available at [http://www.fws.gov/international/pdf/regional\\_program\\_jan06.pdf](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. U. S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE, *WILDLIFE WITHOUT BORDERS – LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN*, available at [http://library.fws.gov/IA\\_Pubs/wwb\\_latnam\\_carib02.pdf](http://library.fws.gov/IA_Pubs/wwb_latnam_carib02.pdf) (last visited May 8, 2006).

<sup>111</sup> Global Environment Facility homepage, <http://www.gefweb.org/> (last visited Mar. 28, 2006).

<sup>112</sup> *Id.*

<sup>113</sup> Global Environment Facility, *Participants*, [http://www.gefweb.org/participants/Members\\_Countries/members\\_countries.html](http://www.gefweb.org/participants/Members_Countries/members_countries.html) (last visited Mar. 28, 2006).

<sup>114</sup> Global Environment Facility, *Replenishment*, <http://www.gefweb.org/Replenishment/replenishment.html> (last visited Feb. 4, 2006).

<sup>115</sup> International Conservation Budget, *supra* note 103, at 8.

<sup>116</sup> See Global Environment Facility, *Project Database*, <http://gefonline.org/home.cfm> (last visited July 9, 2006).

However, there was a single project in Gabon from 1995-1998 to study the wildlife trade conducted there using a \$1 million USD GEF grant.<sup>117</sup> Because it is the financial mechanism of the Convention on Biological Diversity, GEF is an obvious potential source of funding for issues linked with wildlife trade.<sup>118</sup> Exploration and integration of GEF as a targeted source of funds may help the bushmeat crisis. Like other government-related development initiatives linked with the environment, this program falls short on achieving results with actual improved and secured natural resources. A review of funding allocations evaluating the balance of funding for actual protection versus program development is necessary. An assessment of actual conservation outcomes is urgent for this program.

### C. CARPE and the Congo Basin Forest Partnership

Another U.S. program able to provide support in 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.<sup>119</sup> The program is spearheaded by the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID).<sup>120</sup> It operates in the Congo Basin and encompasses the Central African Republic, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Republic of Congo, Burundi, Cameroon, Democratic Republic of Congo, Rwanda, and Sao Tome & Principe.<sup>121</sup> CARPE works with range states and the NGO community to facilitate programs supporting biodiversity protection, with the Congo Basin Forest Partnership (CBFP) as the largest.<sup>122</sup>

CBFP was formed in 2002 by the United States and South Africa jointly, along with 27 private and public organizations.<sup>123</sup> CBFP launched to:

[p]romote economic development, poverty alleviation, improved governance, and natural resources conservation through support for a network of national parks and protected areas, well-managed forestry

---

<sup>117</sup> *Id.*

<sup>118</sup> Global Environment Facility, Project Database, [http://www.gefweb.org/projects/Focal\\_Areas/bio/bio.html](http://www.gefweb.org/projects/Focal_Areas/bio/bio.html) (last visited Mar. 19, 2007).

<sup>119</sup> Central Africa Regional Program for the Environment, History, <http://carpe.umd.edu/Plone/how-carpe-works/history-1> (last visited Mar. 29, 2006).

<sup>120</sup> *Id.*

<sup>121</sup> *Id.*

<sup>122</sup> 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](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](http://www.usaid.gov/about_usaid/presidential_initiative/logging.html).

<sup>123</sup> Central Africa Regional Program for the Environment, [http://carpe.umd.edu/overview2004/cbfp\\_2004.asp](http://carpe.umd.edu/overview2004/cbfp_2004.asp) (last visited Mar. 29, 2006).

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.<sup>124</sup>

The United States invested \$53 million during the first phase of operations (2003-2005)<sup>125</sup> and numerous additional range states, non-range states, and NGOs donated matching funds through grants and in-kind support.<sup>126</sup> The second phase of CBFP recently solicited proposals for the 11 landscapes based on a five-year phase of operations (2006-2011) involving approximately \$45 million USD.<sup>127</sup> Recommendations on expenditures, however, stipulate that at least 50% of these funds must be spent outside protected areas in the landscapes such as development-related activities.<sup>128</sup> While a focus on bushmeat monitoring is a stated priority action of the program it is not yet a funded item.<sup>129</sup>

CBFP separates the forest region into eleven separate landscapes, many of which cross international boundaries.<sup>130</sup> 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."<sup>131</sup> This designation is reminiscent of the North American model of wildlife conservation. They also present capacity building of national governments and communities as a priority in the move toward improved management of wildlife resources. As with the North American model, however, the first order of action is to secure the wildlife resource base and its habitat. Building effective capacity and funding for long-term support of those areas must follow. The CBFP model has great potential for Central Africa but it also requires significant resources targeted at actual conservation activities. While USAID has the mandate and expertise to provide development support linked with a specialized environmental focus, it should have a more balanced level of support for the

---

<sup>124</sup> *Id.*

<sup>125</sup> U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs, Congo Basin Forest Partnership: U.S. Contribution (Dec. 2, 2002), <http://www.state.gov/g/oes/rls/fs/2002/15617.htm>. 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>.

<sup>126</sup> U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs, Congo Basin Forest Partnership: U.S. Contribution (Dec. 2, 2002), <http://www.state.gov/g/oes/rls/fs/2002/15617.htm>.

<sup>127</sup> Grants.gov, USAID-DRC-CARPE Landscape Program Implementation 2006-2011, <http://www.grants.gov/search/search.do?mode=VIEW&oppId=9297> (last visited Mar. 28, 2007). CARPE is the implementing body for CBFP. For more information on this relationship visit <http://carpe.umd.edu/>.

<sup>128</sup> *See id.*

<sup>129</sup> *See id.*

<sup>130</sup> Preliminary Assessment, *supra* note 13, at 17-28.

<sup>131</sup> *Id.* at 16.

essential biodiversity conservation activities that exist parallel to development initiatives.

#### D. *International Conservation Caucus (ICC)*

Members of the House of Representatives and Senate created an opportunity to support this recommended U.S. engagement in international conservation efforts. Members can join one of the largest, bi-partisan caucuses in Congress, the International Conservation Caucus (ICC).<sup>132</sup> The ICC, established in September 2003, provides an opportunity for members of Congress to come together to focus on an issue of global concern.<sup>133</sup> Biodiversity conservation can transcend partisan politics, and unity on an issue of global importance with significant U.S. health and safety implications can rise above the political arena. The mission statement of the ICC provides that:

[t]he 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.<sup>134</sup>

There is no question that the ICC's mission is suitable to support international biodiversity conservation, including the priority issue of bushmeat. The ICC has the potential to prove vital in passing legislation and supporting key funding mechanisms. It could fulfill the directives of international agreements and materialize the key components for success. The North American model of wildlife conservation demonstrates this as the most relevant factor in addressing the bushmeat crisis in Central Africa.<sup>135</sup> Legislation will remain strong only as long as there is long-term, dependable financial support and potent political interest to procure and distribute those resources accordingly. As of June 6, 2005, there were over 100 members of the ICC in the House.<sup>136</sup>

Thus, the United States participates directly and in partnership with a number of funding and program mechanisms. These mechanisms are well-placed to prioritize the most important threat facing wildlife in the Congo Basin today:

---

<sup>132</sup> International Conservation Caucus homepage, <http://www.royce.house.gov/internationalconservation/about.htm> (last visited Apr. 3, 2006).

<sup>133</sup> *Id.*

<sup>134</sup> *Id.*

<sup>135</sup> The effective implementation of legislation places safeguards to protect wildlife from private, non-regulated use. Wildlife laws in the United States not only created punishments for misuse of natural resources but also introduced funding mechanisms to pay for the public use and enjoyment of their home environment.

<sup>136</sup> International Conservation Caucus, Members, <http://www.royce.house.gov/internationalconservation/members.htm> (last visited Apr. 6, 2006).

bushmeat. A coordinated effort to highlight this issue among key government institutions is necessary. This requires a broad-based strategy to support the bushmeat crisis through both increased technical and financial aid within the U.S. government. It is important to recognize that for fiscal year 2005, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service international conservation efforts spent \$18.8 million USD.<sup>137</sup> Multinational Species Conservation Funds, Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Act and US Fish and Wildlife Service International Affairs (CITES, WWB, and other international efforts) funded this.<sup>138</sup> In contrast, the international development assistance budget for USAID was \$1.5 billion USD for fiscal year 2005.<sup>139</sup> This is a tremendous imbalance between U.S. conservation and development commitments. An achievement gap resulted and now requires a balance to successfully address the bushmeat crisis and achieve biodiversity conservation for generations to come. Such an effort, however, requires international agreement regarding the priority of the bushmeat crisis.

#### VII. THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT AND INTERNATIONAL CONSERVATION AGREEMENTS

Four key international conservation efforts 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.<sup>140</sup> The Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) focuses on issues of biodiversity conservation within nations.<sup>141</sup> It has international significance but the U.S. is not a signatory.<sup>142</sup> 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.<sup>143</sup> A new initiative developed by the U.S. Department of State along with other U.S. agencies, governments, and NGO partners, the Coalition Against Wildlife Trafficking (CAWT), aims to unite governments and the non-governmental sector to open constructive dialogue and create a global

---

<sup>137</sup> International Conservation, *supra* note 80. The International Affairs department handles the Multispecies Funds and Wildlife Without Borders program.

<sup>138</sup> *Id.*

<sup>139</sup> Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2005, 2004 H.R. 4818 (July 14, 2004).

<sup>140</sup> Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora, What is CITES?, <http://www.cites.org/eng/disc/what.shtml> (last visited Feb. 4, 2007).

<sup>141</sup> SECRETARIAT OF THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY, SUSTAINING LIFE ON EARTH: HOW THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY PROMOTES NATURE AND HUMAN WELL-BEING 9 (2000), available at <http://www.biodiv.org/doc/publications/cbd-sustain-en.pdf>.

<sup>142</sup> The Convention on Biological Diversity, Parties to the CBD, <http://www.biodiv.org/world/parties.asp> (last visited Mar. 28, 2007).

<sup>143</sup> IUCN, The World Conservation Union – About IUCN, <http://www.iucn.org/en/about/> (last visited Feb. 4, 2006).

partnership that focuses efforts on the illegal wildlife trade with an initial focus in Asia.<sup>144</sup> Each of these efforts offers important opportunities for addressing the bushmeat crisis in Central Africa and illegal wildlife trafficking around the globe.

A. *Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora*

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."<sup>145</sup> CITES came into effect on July 1, 1975 with the support of 80 countries, including the United States, United Kingdom, South Africa, and Brazil.<sup>146</sup> The Convention places flora and fauna into various appendices, ranging from Appendix I (animals threatened with extinction) to Appendix III, (species protected in at least one country).<sup>147</sup> Today, CITES has a membership of 169 parties.<sup>148</sup> It is influential in focusing on the trade in illegal elephant ivory, whales, and numerous other species as well as supporting international conservation initiatives throughout the world.<sup>149</sup> Government signatories fund CITES, with each member party contributing funds based on the U.N. contributions scale.<sup>150</sup> The U.S. has committed \$1,071,138 to CITES for 2006, approximately 22% of the total CITES funding.<sup>151</sup>

Membership in CITES requires the joining party to fulfill a number of obligations. There is a requirement for management and scientific authorities to regulate trade and to document CITES implementation within the host country.<sup>152</sup> CITES requests parties attend biennial conferences and requires them to either confiscate smuggled goods, send the goods back to the originating country, or penalize the violators.<sup>153</sup> Enforcement is left up to the individual

---

<sup>144</sup> U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE, ANNOUNCING THE FORMATION OF CAWT, *available at* <http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/53854.pdf> (last visited Feb. 4, 2007).

<sup>145</sup> Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora, What is CITES?, <http://www.cites.org/eng/disc/what.shtml> (last visited Mar. 6, 2007).

<sup>146</sup> Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora, List of Contracting Parties, <http://www.cites.org/eng/disc/parties/chronolo.shtml> (last visited Mar. 6, 2007).

<sup>147</sup> Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora, How CITES works, <http://www.cites.org/eng/disc/how.shtml> (last visited Mar. 7, 2007).

<sup>148</sup> CITES, *supra* note 93.

<sup>149</sup> *Id.*

<sup>150</sup> SARAH FITZGERALD, INTERNATIONAL WILDLIFE TRADE: WHOSE BUSINESS IS IT? 355 (World Wildlife Fund 1990).

<sup>151</sup> CITES Trust Fund Status of Contributions as of 31 December 2006, <http://www.cites.org/eng/disc/funds/CT.pdf> (last visited Mar. 6, 2007).

<sup>152</sup> Fitzgerald, *supra* note 150, at 322.

<sup>153</sup> *Id.* at 355.

country and CITES is only enforceable by its individual members, with parties strongly urged to pass appropriate legislation.<sup>154</sup> This individualism leaves CITES implementation to the “national and political will” of member parties.<sup>155</sup>

Recognizing that the unregulated bushmeat trade threatened species survival throughout Africa, CITES created the Bushmeat Working Group (BWG).<sup>156</sup> The collective aim of the BWG is to “promote awareness and action to achieve better and sustainable management of the bushmeat trade.”<sup>157</sup> BWG funding came from outside grants secured by the Bushmeat Crisis Task Force and UK-DEFRA. These funds were for general operations and meetings for its first phase of operations (2002-2004) and the group was officially mandated to continue operations for a second phase (2005-2007).<sup>158</sup> However, the group was unfortunately unsuccessful in securing funding for their *Proposal for a Second Phase in the Central African Sub-Region* in September 2004.<sup>159</sup> The second phase proposal supported an increase in anti-poaching units, creating collaborative frameworks of the private sector, civil society, and local community groups, and strengthening institutions to deal with trade.<sup>160</sup> While the proposal was not successfully funded, there is still significant interest in the region supporting the implementation of the CITES BWG plan.<sup>161</sup> However, the current international bushmeat trade still includes endangered species.<sup>162</sup> This illegal, undetected and unregulated mandating requires further CITES engagement and commitment.

### B. Convention on Biological Diversity

Another major multi-national conservation agreement is the Convention on

---

<sup>154</sup> *Id.* at 323, (stating that United States implemented CITES through Endangered Species Act of 1973).

<sup>155</sup> INTERNATIONAL WILDLIFE TRADE: A CITES SOURCE BOOK 5 (Ginette Hemley ed. 1994).

<sup>156</sup> Convention on International trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora, Bushmeat, <http://www.cites.org/eng/prog/bushmeat.shtml> (last visited Mar. 6, 2007).

<sup>157</sup> *Id.*

<sup>158</sup> CITES Bush Meat Working Group, *Report Fourth Ordinary Meeting of Members and Partners of the CITE Bushmeat Working Group*, F 11/03 ( Mar. 26-28, 2003), available at <http://www.cites.org/eng/prog/bushmeat.shtml>.

<sup>159</sup> CITES, *supra* note 93.

<sup>160</sup> *Id.* at 4-5.

<sup>161</sup> Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora Bush Meat Working Group, *Rapport 4eme Reunion Ordinaire Des Membres et Partenaires du Groupe de Travail CITES Sur Law Viande De Brousse [Report Fourth Ordinary Meeting of Members and Partners of the CITE Bushmeat Working Group]*, available at [http://www.cites.org/common/prog/bushmeat/4th\\_meet.pdf](http://www.cites.org/common/prog/bushmeat/4th_meet.pdf) (last visited Mar. 3, 2007).

<sup>162</sup> See IFAW AND BCTF, BCTF FACT SHEET: BUSHMEAT ORPHANS AND PRIMATE SANCTUARIESCRISIS (2003), available at <http://www.bushmeat.org/cd/fs/FSwestcentralCD.pdf>. Discussing the fate of orphaned endangered primates.

Biological Diversity (CBD), which the United States has not joined.<sup>163</sup> The CBD, signed by 150 countries at the 1992 Rio Earth Summit, dedicates funds to the support of sustainable development.<sup>164</sup> CBD has the ambitious goal “to achieve by 2010 a significant reduction of the current rate of biodiversity loss at the global, regional and national level as a contribution to poverty alleviation and to the benefit of all life on earth.”<sup>165</sup> The convention receives funding from members and concerned parties, with money deposited in a number of trusts.<sup>166</sup> Total expected revenues through 2006 are \$3,487,989 USD.<sup>167</sup> Although not a member, the United States has pledged \$100,000 USD to the CBD general fund for 2006.<sup>168</sup> The CBD peripherally engages in the bushmeat issue itself through the commissioned production of scientific reviews of the bushmeat crisis and the role of CBD.<sup>169</sup> The CBD has yet to identify, develop, or implement any significant effort with regards to the bushmeat trade in Africa.<sup>170</sup> Any such effort should contain at least a reporting of countries linked with monitoring and evaluation of conservation outcomes as associated with the bushmeat trade.

### C. *International Union of Concerned Scientists*

The International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN) unites 82 governments, 111 government agencies, more than 800 NGOs, and approximately 10,000 scientists and experts from 181 countries in a “unique worldwide partnership.”<sup>171</sup> 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.”<sup>172</sup> In 2002, the United States

<sup>163</sup> Convention on Biological Diversity, <http://www.biodiv.org/convention/default.shtml> (last visited Dec. 14, 2005).

<sup>164</sup> *Id.*

<sup>165</sup> Convention on Biological Diversity, Introduction to the 2010 Biodiversity Target, <http://www.biodiv.org/2010-target/default.asp> (last visited Mar. 6, 2007).

<sup>166</sup> Convention on Biological Diversity, Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity/ Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, <http://www.biodiv.org/world/parties.asp?tab=1&menu=home> (last visited Mar. 6, 2007). Much of this money remains unpaid as of March 28, 2006.

<sup>167</sup> *Id.*

<sup>168</sup> Convention on Biological Diversity, Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity/ Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, <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.

<sup>169</sup> An example report, UNITED NATIONS ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAM, SUSTAINABLE USE: DEVELOPMENT OF PRACTICAL PRINCIPLES, OPERATIONAL GUIDANCE AND ASSOCIATED INSTRUMENTS, can be viewed at <http://www.biodiv.org/doc/meetings/sbstta/sbstta-09/official/sbstta-09-09-add2-en.pdf>.

<sup>170</sup> See generally Convention on Biological Diversity, What's New, <http://www.biodiv.org/default.shtml>. A search of all CBD program areas will reveal no bushmeat related activities.

<sup>171</sup> International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources, IUCN Overview, <http://www.iucn.org/en/about/index.htm> (last visited May 9, 2006).

<sup>172</sup> *Id.*



contributed approximately \$3,900,000 to the IUCN through the State Department and other U.S. agencies (6% of total IUCN contributions).<sup>173</sup> Currently, the Union is in a program through 2008 that focuses on sustainable management of natural resources for long-term use, with a special emphasis on poorer communities.<sup>174</sup> The IUCN also passed a resolution regarding the bushmeat issue in 2000.<sup>175</sup> Programs implementing the recommendations of the resolution have been coupled with workshops to develop increased understanding and action planning for the bushmeat issue.<sup>176</sup> 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).<sup>177</sup> The IUCN is extremely well-positioned with its network of scientists and experts; its networks with development programs can lead efforts to address targeted bushmeat projects throughout the region.

#### *D. Coalition Against Wildlife Trafficking*

The Coalition Against Wildlife Trafficking (CAWT) was officially established in 2005.<sup>178</sup> This was after recognition of the negative impacts of illegal logging on international wildlife by G-8 leaders in July 2005.<sup>179</sup> The CAWT initiative brings together various U.S. government agencies and other nations, including the U.K., India and Australia.<sup>180</sup> This initiative addresses the illegal wildlife trade through a coordinated approach focused on effective information management, law enforcement, capacity building, and raising awareness.<sup>181</sup> As a forward-thinking policy approach, CAWT is a model

---

<sup>173</sup> International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources, Finances, <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.

<sup>174</sup> International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources, IUCN Overview, <http://www.iucn.org/en/about/index.htm> (last visited May 9, 2005).

<sup>175</sup> See IUCN, 2.64 THE UNSUSTAINABLE COMMERCIAL TRADE IN WILD MEAT (2000) available at <http://www.bushmeat.org/cd/meetings/IUCN%202000%20res%202-64.pdf>.

<sup>176</sup> IUCN, *IUCN Leads International Cooperation to Combat the Growing "Bushmeat" Problem*, July 27, 2001, at [http://www.iucn.org/themes/ssc/news/2002\\_and\\_earlier\\_articles/bushmeatworkshop.html](http://www.iucn.org/themes/ssc/news/2002_and_earlier_articles/bushmeatworkshop.html) (last visited Feb. 4, 2007).

<sup>177</sup> For a full list of IUCN members, search the database at <http://intranet.iucn.org/kb/pub/members/directory.cfm> (last visited Feb. 4, 2007).

<sup>178</sup> U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE, ANNOUNCING THE FORMATION OF CAWT, available at <http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/53854.pdf> (last visited Feb. 2, 2006).

<sup>179</sup> *Id.*

<sup>180</sup> *Id.*

<sup>181</sup> *Id.* These U.S. agencies include the Departments of Interior, Justice, Agriculture, Homeland Security, and State.

initiative for consideration by the U.S. government in addressing world biodiversity and the Central African bushmeat. CAWT has the possibility to help create solutions to the global issue of wildlife trade. CAWT will also help the U.S. look inward and has the potential to create new policies that effectively combat the illegal bushmeat and wildlife trade that takes place within its own borders – from rural New Hampshire to California.

CAWT's initial priority is wildlife trafficking in Asia.<sup>182</sup> Efforts of CBFP, CITES, IUCN and others in Central Africa will provide helpful case study analysis as the CAWT initiative expands. CAWT is intended to be a global partnership of governments and NGOs, as well as multiple agencies within government (e.g. USFWS, NOAA, and DOJ).<sup>183</sup> It signals the leadership and initiative necessary to mobilize critical partnerships and encourage resource commitments to address the global impact of unsustainable wildlife trafficking.

Funding for programs addressing international conservation relies on yearly government appropriations and is not at the level suggested by the International Conservation Budget consortium.<sup>184</sup> While these efforts play important roles in addressing goals toward biodiversity conservation, none have attained the suggested funding levels from the consortium and, as a consequence, it may be difficult to properly monitor and evaluate their impacts. There must be an increase in financial resources and a coordinated effort among U.S. agencies and international agreements of the U.S. to effect greater achievement of biodiversity conservation goals linked with the bushmeat crisis. Realizing such goals is also dependent upon range state leadership and commitment to biodiversity conservation.

### VIII. RANGE STATE BIODIVERSITY COLLABORATION

A number of Central African nations recognized the need for a united, range state response to biodiversity loss. Largely driven by the bushmeat crisis as well as habitat alteration from logging and other development activities, these nations 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.<sup>185</sup> The heads of six African nations signed this declaration, in which a framework was created to

---

<sup>182</sup> *Id.*

<sup>183</sup> *Id.*

<sup>184</sup> The International Conservation Budget is a pamphlet produced by four major conservation organizations that suggest appropriate funding levels for United States support of international conservation programs. To receive a copy of the pamphlet contact one of the four member organizations, WWF, WCS, CI, or TNC.

<sup>185</sup> World Wildlife Fund, *Yaoundé Declaration: Conserving the Congo Basin Forest*, [http://www.panda.org/about\\_wwf/where\\_we\\_work/africa/solutions\\_by\\_region/congo\\_basin\\_forests/wwf\\_solutions/yaounde\\_summit/index.cfm](http://www.panda.org/about_wwf/where_we_work/africa/solutions_by_region/congo_basin_forests/wwf_solutions/yaounde_summit/index.cfm) (last visited Mar. 28, 2007).

develop “new transboundary and regional conservation efforts.”<sup>186</sup> This declaration established the formation of the Commission of Ministers in charge of Forests in Central Africa (COMIFAC).<sup>187</sup> 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.”<sup>188</sup> In 2004, the organization changed its name to the Central African Forest Commission, keeping the initials COMIFAC.<sup>189</sup>

The signing of COMIFAC’s treaty took place in Brazzaville, Republic of Congo in February 2005.<sup>190</sup> At this meeting, the signatories agreed to the COMIFAC Plan of Convergence, giving the commission its legal authority within the region.<sup>191</sup> The Plan gives Central African states the ability “to have a common and shared vision of the conservation and the sustainable management of their ecosystems” through its objective, “to coordinate and to harmonize the intervention strategies of the various stakeholders of the sub-region.”<sup>192</sup> Members to this plan agreed to include conservation of forests as a national priority.<sup>193</sup> This included certification systems for wood products, instituting sustainable development financing, fostering inter-country cooperation, and developing transparent procedures for wildlife and forest products trade.<sup>194</sup> Funding for COMIFAC comes from member states but the plan allows for the acquisition of funds from international development organizations.<sup>195</sup>

Another important African multi-national agreement is the Africa Forest Law Enforcement and Governance (AFLEG) ministerial declaration signed on October 16, 2003.<sup>196</sup> The AFLEG declaration looks to strengthen good

<sup>186</sup> Preliminary Assessment, *supra* note 13, at 1.

<sup>187</sup> Treaty COMIFAC, Brazzaville 2005, available at <http://assets.panda.org/downloads/traitecomifacbrassaville2005.pdf> (last visited Mar. 28, 2007) (in French).

<sup>188</sup> Government of France, Foreign Affairs Ministry, Brazzaville Summit – The Central Africa Forests Commission, [http://www.diplomatie.gouv.fr/en/france-priorities\\_1/environment-sustainable-development\\_1097/brazzaville-summit-4-5-february-2005\\_2082/the-central-africa-forests-commission-comifac\\_1637.html](http://www.diplomatie.gouv.fr/en/france-priorities_1/environment-sustainable-development_1097/brazzaville-summit-4-5-february-2005_2082/the-central-africa-forests-commission-comifac_1637.html) (last visited Mar. 18, 2006).

<sup>189</sup> *Id.*

<sup>190</sup> *Id.*

<sup>191</sup> Government of France, Foreign Affairs Ministry, Brazzaville Summit – The Sub-Regional Convergence Plan, [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](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.

<sup>192</sup> *Id.*

<sup>193</sup> Treaty on the Conservation and Sustainable Management of Forest Ecosystems in Central Africa and to Establish the Central African Forests Commission (COMIFAC), Feb. 5, 2005 available at [http://www.cbfp.org/docs\\_gb/treaty-english.pdf](http://www.cbfp.org/docs_gb/treaty-english.pdf) (last visited Mar. 18, 2006).

<sup>194</sup> *Id.*

<sup>195</sup> *Id.*

<sup>196</sup> Africa Forest Law and Enforcement Governance Ministerial Conference, Ministerial

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.<sup>197</sup> The "FLEG" process has also been initiated in Europe and Asia and receives support from both producer and consumer nations.<sup>198</sup> The goal of the process is to address the "widespread failure of forest governance and law enforcement" as this failure "directly undermines any nation's attempt to achieve sustainable economic growth, societal equity, and environmental protection."<sup>199</sup>

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. This is unlikely in AFLEG signatories like the Democratic Republic of Congo,<sup>200</sup> which is still in the midst of a transitional government after assassination of its leader in 2001.<sup>201</sup> 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 received major support from the Congo Basin Forest Partnership efforts previously described.<sup>202</sup> 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.<sup>203</sup> 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. An immediate call to action is needed to secure the necessary funding and ensure mechanisms for improved capacity and long-term

Declaration, Oct. 16, 2003., available at [http://www.cbfp.org/docs\\_gb/afleg.pdf](http://www.cbfp.org/docs_gb/afleg.pdf) (last visited Mar. 13, 2006).

<sup>197</sup> *Id.*

<sup>198</sup> FORESTS MONITOR, AFLEG BRIEFING NOTE, available at [http://www.forestsmonitor.org/afleg/en/AFLEG\\_note\\_fm\\_en.pdf](http://www.forestsmonitor.org/afleg/en/AFLEG_note_fm_en.pdf) (last visited Mar. 30, 2006).

<sup>199</sup> Africa Forest Governance and Law Enforcement Conference, Planning Meeting, [http://www.forestsmonitor.org/afleg/en/AFLEG\\_note\\_wb\\_en.pdf](http://www.forestsmonitor.org/afleg/en/AFLEG_note_wb_en.pdf) (last visited Mar. 30, 2006).

<sup>200</sup> Sustainable Developments, Africa Forest Law Enforcement and Governance Process, <http://www.iisd.ca/sd/sdyao/13oct.html> (last visited Mar. 30, 2006).

<sup>201</sup> WORLD FACT BOOK, *supra* note 78.

<sup>202</sup> Congo Basin Forest Partnership homepage, <http://www.cbfp.org/en/index.htm> (last visited Feb. 18, 2007).

<sup>203</sup> UNITED NATIONS FOUNDATION, ET AL., CENTRAL AFRICAN WORLD HERITAGE INITIATIVE, available at [http://portal.unesco.org/culture/en/file\\_download.php/621af459cc945bee1e254e5a31e4a963CAWHFI.pdf](http://portal.unesco.org/culture/en/file_download.php/621af459cc945bee1e254e5a31e4a963CAWHFI.pdf).

management of the wildlife resource.

## IX. CONCLUSION

IUCN estimates that as of 2006, 23% of mammals, 53% of invertebrates, 70% of plants, and 40% of total evaluated species are at risk of extinction worldwide.<sup>204</sup> These numbers suggest that detailed *in situ* fieldwork needs bolstering through legislation, adequate funding, and professional capacity that reaches 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.

The total value of the bushmeat trade of Central Africa is thought to be as high as \$50 million USD per year.<sup>205</sup> The bushmeat crisis interacts with a number of local factors that will only continue to negatively affect biodiversity, unless proper funding is procured.<sup>206</sup> Recognizing the inherent problems with localized park structures, the U.S. government helped institute CBF, building on a landscape approach to ecosystem conservation.<sup>207</sup> While this model has great potential, no international or range state agreement has enough strength or funding to achieve 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 involves a region-wide enabling of wildlife management through formation of protected areas and development of the wildlife profession.<sup>208</sup> Placing value on the living wildlife resource supported this system. The emergence of a wildlife industry further supported by a wealthy citizenry could shift values of wildlife from utilitarian to intrinsic. Funds made available

---

<sup>204</sup> IUCN, 2006 IUCN Red List of Threatened Species, <http://www.redlist.org/info/tables/table1.html> (last visited April 3, 2006).

<sup>205</sup> JOANNA ELLIOT, WILDLIFE AND POVERTY STUDY: SUMMARY OF PHASE ONE REPORT (2001), available at <http://www.forestforum.org.uk/docs/WAP-Dec17-2pg-overview.doc> (last visited Dec. 15, 2005).

<sup>206</sup> Eves, *supra* note 3.

<sup>207</sup> Congo Basin Forest Partnership homepage, <http://www.cbf.org/en/index.htm>.

<sup>208</sup> Geist, *supra* note 43.

through robust taxation, law enforcement, and governance systems further supported the wildlife industry, in addition to the self-policing and democratic governance.

The North American model of wildlife management contrasts with the current priorities and capacities of developing world governments and communities. This occurs in biodiversity best-practices, government transparency, and financial management.<sup>209</sup> Lack of financial resources and capacity to effectively support or promote natural resource conservation hinder governments that also face mounting poverty and increasing human populations.<sup>210</sup> Immediate utilitarian needs for wildlife drive local communities 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.<sup>211</sup> These sources, if at their full authorization and facilitated through a collaborative process, could offset many of the shortfalls currently facing Central African governments and assist in their inability to adequately address the bushmeat crisis. Numerous signed multi-national agreements that address the bushmeat crisis through protected areas, provision of alternatives, adequate law enforcement, and capacity building call for such funding.<sup>212</sup>

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

---

<sup>209</sup> See generally Lapham, *supra* note 38 (discussing the needs for effective biodiversity conservation in developing world countries).

<sup>210</sup> *Id.*

<sup>211</sup> Among these potential sources are the government programs mentioned earlier.

<sup>212</sup> Many of the agreements referenced in this paper call for such funding.