Distribution des ours dans l'UE + Réalité actuelle de la population pyrénéenne : une sous population de la vaste population dinaro-pindique (qui s'étend de la Slovénie au Nord et au Sud de la Grèce)+ dégâts en Slovénie, France, Espagne
traduction et note: B. Besche-Commenge ASPAP/ADDIP

European Commission

Status, management and distribution of large carnivores

– bear, lynx, wolf & wolverine –

in Europe

DECEMBER 2012

- Part 1-

1. Distribution

In Europe, the brown bears occur in 22 countries. Based on the existing data on distribution, as well as a range of geographic, ecological, social and political factors these can be clustered into 10 populations: Scandinavian, Karelian, Baltic, Carpathian, Dinaric-Pindos, Eastern Balkan, Alpine, Central Apennine, Cantabrian, and Pyrenean (Fig. 1).

Russie non comptée

2. Population estimates & monitoring

The estimated total number of brown bears in Europe seems to be in the range of 17'000 individuals. Based on reported and updated census data, the largest population is the Carpathian population (>7000 bears), followed by the Scandinavian and Dinaric-Pindos populations (> 3000 bears). The other populations are much smaller ranging from several hundred (e.g. Baltic ~700, Cantabrian ~200) to less than hundred (e.g. Alps 45-50, Pyrenean 22-27).

Compared to the last survey that included data up to 2005 (Bear Online Information System for Europe, BOIS) the Scandinavian, Karelian, Dinaric-Pindos, Baltic, Cantabrian, and Pyrenean population have recorded a clear increase. The other populations remained stable. The decrease in the Eastern Balkan population is likely due to new monitoring techniques. All population ranges have been relatively stable or slightly expanding. In the Alpine population the loss of the central Austrian segment was counterbalanced by the expansion of the north Italian segment in Trentino.

Monitoring in a number of countries/populations is based on genetic methods that use non-invasively collected DNA (from scats or hairs): Scandinavia, Italy, Austria, Spain, France, Greece, Slovenia. In other countries genetic methods are used to compliment or confirm data obtain by other methods (counts at feeding sites, snow tracking and telemetry): Croatia, Poland, Slovakia. In the countries without genetics and telemetry, absolute estimates are based on much weaker grounds. The small populations are generally subject to more intense and costly monitoring methods trying to count individuals, although the most closely monitored large population is in Scandinavia. In hunted populations harvest data is used to identify population trends.

3. Legal status and removal options

Most of the bear populations are strictly protected. The parts of populations that fall within EU countries, are strictly protected under pan-European legislation (the Habitats Directive) and no exceptions under annex 5 exist. Sweden, Finland, Romania, Estonia, Bulgaria, Slovenia and Slovakia currently use derogations under article 16 of the directive to allow a limited cull of bears by hunters. Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Norway manage bears as a game species with annual quotas as they are only limited by the Bern Convention in this respect. For Croatia this will end in 2013 when the EU regulations will be adopted. Nearly all countries have some kind of bear management plan, action plan or bear management strategy. However, in a number of countries such a document is still waiting to be adequately implemented.

4. Conflicts and conflict management

Bears are large, opportunistic and omnivorous carnivores with a wide range of biological needs during their life cycle, which may bring them into conflict with humans. Some conflict types threaten human interests (e.g. property loss like livestock depredation or attacks on humans), some threaten bears (e.g. habitat fragmentation and den disturbance) and some are mutually problematic (e.g. traffic accidents).

Most countries pay damage compensations either from the state budget or from funds contributed by interest groups, mostly by hunters. The rough economic cost (based on reported compensation only and excluding mitigation) is in the magnitude of 2.5-3.0 M€ per year. Livestock losses are the most important damage type, but the variety of damages are much wider than for wolves, wolverines, and lynx and include damages to bee hives, orchards, crops, trees, and even vehicles and buildings. More than half of all money is paid for compensations in Norway (1.5 M€), followed by 321'000 € in the Cantabrian Mountains, and 252'000 € in Slovenia. Other countries pay between

17

Ours Pyrénées / ours Europe = 0,12%,
/population Dinaric-Pindos = 0,73% (voir page suivante)

7.2.3. Connectivity with other populations

POPULATION	Connectivity
Scandinavia	The population is potentially connected with the Karelian population through dispersing males, but probably not by dispersing females.
Karelian (this time not including Russia west of 35°E)	The Karelian population probably has some level of genetic exchange with the Scandinavian population to the south and west. Both the Karelian and Baltic populations are connected to the main distribution area of Russian bears to the east and thereby with each other. The separation between the two populations is made here only as an administrative decision to produce units of practical size and with more homogenous internal conditions.
Baltic (this time not including Belarus and the Russian oblasts of Lenningrad, Novgorod, Pskov, Tver, Smolensk, Bryansk, Moscow, Kalinigrad, Kaluzh, Tula, Kursk, Belgorod & Ore)	
Carpathian (this time not including Ukraine)	The closest population is in northern Bulgaria and southeastern Serbia, but the movement of individual bears may be very restricted due to the Danube which acts as a physical barrier. There are some questions concerning internal connectivity within the Carpathian population due to a lack of knowledge about the situation within Ukraine and the developments of bear distribution in eastern Slovakia.
Dinaric-Pindos	In Slovenia in the north this population is close to the one of the Alps and bears in Trentino and Slovenia are connected by single male dispersers. However, there is not a continuous distribution of female bears with the Alps. Historical connections with the Carpathian population through Serbia and with the Eastern Balkans through "the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" are now unlikely.
Alpine	The most important potential connection is with their source population, the Dinaric-Pindos. A few individual bears have been shown to move between these two populations in both directions.
Eastern Balkans	The Greek part of the Rila-Rhodope segment is near the Dinaric-Pindos population but there is no demonstrated connection between these two populations. To the north of the Stara-Planina segment there is a potential, but unproven, connection to the Carpathian population. Within the Eastern Balkans the main challenge is to maintain connections among the three segments of this population.
Central Apennine	It has been totally isolated for over a century. There is no possibility of reestablishing unassisted connectivity in the short term.
Cantabrian	It has been totally isolated for over a century. There is no possibility of reestablishing unassisted connectivity in the short term.
Pyrenean	It has been totally isolated for over a century. There is no possibility of reestablishing connectivity in the short term. Due to re-introductions, genetically the Pyrenean population now consists of bears from the Dinaric-Pindos population.

7.3. IUCN assessment:

POPULATION	IUCN assessment
Scandinavia	LC
Karelian	LC (in connection with Russia west of 35°E)
Baltic	LC (in connection with the Russian oblasts of Lenningrad, Novgorod, Pskov, Tver, Smolensk, Bryansk, Moscow, Kalinigrad, Kaluzh, Tula, Kursk, Belgorod & Ore)
Carpathian	NT (including and not including Ukraine)
Dinaric-Pindos	VU
Alps	CE
Eastern Balkans	VU
Central Apennine	CE
Cantabrian	CE
Pyrenean	CE

Pyrénées: population totalement isolée depuis plus d'un siècle. Aucune possibilité de rétablir la connectivité à court terme. A cause des réintroductions ***la population pyrénéenne consiste actuellement en ours de la population Dinaric-Pindos***

Slovénie augmentation des dommages depuis 2007 - en 2010 :650 ovins, 15 pour bovins, équins, porcins ensemble + 425 autres types de dommages

7.5. Conflict type and costs:

[*Mostly by country rather than population, country attributed to the population it has the largest share with*]

POPULATION	Conflict type and costs / years
Scandinavia	Norway (2006-2011 range): up to 2 M € for sheep (3800-7000) and recently up to 35'000 € for semi-domestic reindeer (4-75) Sweden (2006-2011): 37'000 € sheep (50-100 sheep & few other livestock). In addition comes the bear's share of the economic incentive paid to reindeer herders for the presence of large carnivores. In 2009 this was ~187'000 €.
Karelian population (this time not included Russia west of 35°E)	Finland (2007-2011 mean): 750'000 € for 681 reindeer & 172'700 € other depredation (30-100 sheep, 0-5 other livestock (cattle, horses), 0-4 dogs, 150-250 beehives, hundeds packages of silage some damage in oatfields (not quantifiable from records)
Baltic (this time not included Belarus and the Russian oblasts of Lenningrad, Novgorod, Pskov, Tver, Smolensk, Bryansk, Moscow, Kalinigrad, Kaluzh, Tula, Kursk, Belgorod & Ore)	Estonia (2007-2011): almost no livestock depredation, most damages on beehives 12'500 € (105 hives) Latvia (2006-2011): no damages and no damage compensation system for bears
Carpathian (this time not included Ukraine)	Romania: no information available Poland (2010): 61,555 € (556 beehives), strongly increasing trend since 2007, only very occasionally livestock Serbia-E: no information available Slovakia (2006-2010): 5500 € (160 sheep/goat), 1200-2900 € (0-15 cattle), 12'000 € (200 beehives)
Dinaric-Pindos	Slovenia (2010): 252'497 € (number of attacks: 650 sheep/goat, 15 cattle/horses/pigs, 425 other like bee hives, agriculture, orchards, animal feed, car accidents, feeders), increasing trend since 2007 Croatia (2007-2010): 6000 € (2-20 sheep/goats, 0-33 beehives, crop and fruit tree damage, very occasional cattle / horses or poultry) Bosnia & Herzegovina (2007-2011): 42 sheep, 20 cattle/horse/pig, 23 beehives, 5 orchards Montenegro: no information "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" (including East Balkan part) (2007): 53 sheep/goat, 167 cattle/horse/donkey/pig, 152 beehives Albania: no data and no compensation system Serbia-SW: no information Greece: (2006-2010): 19'000 € (200 sheep/goat), 98'000 € (215 cattle/horse), 24'000 € (530 beehives/swarms)
Alpine	Italy (Trentino, 2006-2011 mean): 17'000 € for sheep/goats, 4000 for rabbits/ chickens, 27'000 for beehives Austria (2008-2011): highly variable but ~10-100 sheep, ~0-2 other livestock (e.g. cattle, rabbits),~10-30 beehives,~0-25 canisters with rape-seed oil Switzerland: attacks mainly on sheep and beehives. Amount varies between years.
Eastern Balkans	Bulgaria (2007-2011): ~81,850 € for ~ 249 sheep; 18 goats; 27 cattle; 6 horses/donkeys; 12 pigs; 3 dogs; 533 beehives; 58 fruit trees; others - black chokeberry (Aronia melanocarpa) - 325 kg (increasing tendency due to better informed locals for the opportunity for compensation) Serbia -SE: no information
Central Apennine	(2006-2011 mean): 22'000 € (136 sheep/goats), 29'000 € (47 other livestock), (2011): 45,188 € for other damages
Cantabrian	(2010): 321'000 mainly for beehives and livestock
Pyrenean	France (2006-2011 mean): 103'000 € for 200 sheep / goats, 31 beehives Spain (2010): 20'500 € for 70 sheep and 29 beehives

Dégâts dus aux ours: Pyrénées France 200 têtes de bétail, 31 ruches (103.000 €);Espagne 70 brebis, 29 ruches (20.500 €) - Monts cantabrique: 321.000 € pour ruches et bétail.

7.6. Critical management issues

POPULATION	Conflict type and costs / years
Scandinavia	The major pressure in Norway remains to the issue of damages to unguarded free-ranging sheep. This chronic conflict has led to parliament setting very low population goals for bear recovery. The goals from 2003 have been slightly downgraded in 2011. Although conflicts have been low in Sweden, new conflicts are appearing as bears expand into more densely populated areas. However, generally the bear is well accepted and managed in Sweden.
Karelian population **Baltic**	In connection with bears in Belaruss and Russia these populations are large and occupy a large area safeguarding their favorable conservation status. However, the lack of reliable and regular information from Belaruss or Russia makes it difficult to assess population or range changes.
Carpathian (this time not includeding Ukraine)	The distribution map for Slovakia is based on data pooled over the last 20 years and the accuracy of monitoring methods have been questioned. The lack of recent information from Ukraine makes an overall assessment difficult.
Dinaric-Pindos	In Slovenia increasing damages and an increase in nuisance bears are making it a challenge to maintain bear numbers at the present level, let alone allow for the spreading of the population into the Alps. With Croatia entering the EU, the status of the bear was changed from "game species" to "fully protected". Hunting is now labelled culling and has to happen under the EU derogation regulation which weakens the hunters' stake and support for bear management. This population is shared by many countries and subject to widely varying monitoring methods and standards. There is a general lack of accessible and robust data from Bosnia & Herzegovina, Montenegro, Albania and "the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia".
Alpine	Initiatives to coordinate and harmonize bear management between Italy, Switzerland, Austria and Germany are currently under way. However, the occurrence of food conditioned and/or habituated bears remain a management challenge.
Eastern Balkans	Bulgaria has developed a new bear management plan and controversies seem to have calmed down. In Greece habitat fragmentation remains a conservation concern.
Central Apennine	Occasional losses due to poaching or other human related accidents still occur and the population remains stagnant despite regular reproduction events.
Cantabrian	The western population segment shows an obvious increase (from 3 females with cubs of the year (COYs) recorded in 1994 to 25 in 2010), while the eastern one seems stagnant with very few females with COYs.
Pyrenees	Acceptance for the re-introduced bears seems still a problem and losses due to poaching or other human related accidents still occur.

Problèmes/Slovénie:
"*L'augmentation des dommages et des nuisances dus aux ours nuisibles rendent difficile de maintenir le nombre d'ours à son niveau actuel, et encore moins de permettre l'expansion de la population dans les Alpes*"

Problèmes / Pyrénées
"*L'acceptation des ours réintroduits semble encore être un problème, et des pertes ont encore lieu dues au braconnage ou à d'autres accidents d'origine humaine.*"