2017 Polar Bear Technical Committee
Status Table Terms

1. **Purpose**

Under its Terms of Reference, the Polar Bear Technical Committee (PBTC) is to provide an annual report to the Polar Bear Administrative Committee (PBAC) on the status of each of Canada's 13 sub-populations of polar bears that is based upon the best available scientific information and Traditional Ecological Knowledge.

This document defines the various terms used in the Status Table and the basis on which the status of each sub-population was assessed by the PBTC in February 2017.

2. **Definitions**

2.1 Population Estimate

The most recent estimate of abundance reviewed and accepted by the PBTC.

2.2 Historic Trend

Historic trend is the PBTC's assessment of changes in abundance that a sub-population may have experienced since the signing of the international Agreement on the Conservation of Polar Bears (1973), which led to current management practices and research. The most recent population estimate and the first comparable documented historic estimate are examined. If a direct comparison of abundance estimates cannot be made or there is only a single estimate of abundance, other lines of evidence may be used in this assessment.

2.3 TEK Assessment

This column represents an assessment using traditional knowledge (TK) or Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit on the status of each of the polar bear subpopulations.

Known also by many related terms, such as indigenous knowledge, local and traditional knowledge, traditional ecological knowledge, Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit, etc. While there are some differences in how and where these terms are used, the basic idea is similar: knowledge that has been gained by experience and shared among members of a group or community, often across generations. (Huntington 2013)

Wherever possible, TK should be documented, attributable to a source, validated and corroborated as appropriate, and vetted by a responsible management authority before submission to the PBTC for consideration.

2.4 Recent Trend (15 Years Ago to Present)

Recent trend is the PBTC's assessment of the direction of abundance over the last 15 years. The objective of this assessment is to inform the PBAC as to whether a sub-population has increased, decreased, or remained stable. Recent trend is assessed by comparing the most recent population estimate to the previous population estimate. If a direct comparison of

population estimates cannot be made or is not applicable, other lines of evidence such as population viability analyses, productivity indicators, and recent harvest pressure may be used to infer any changes in recent abundance.

2.5 Future Trend (Present to 10 Years into the Future)

Future trend is the PBTC's assessment of the anticipated direction of abundance. The objective of this assessment is to inform the PBAC as to whether a sub-population is likely to increase, decrease, or remain stable over the next 10 years. Multiple lines of evidence including but not limited to population estimates, population viability analyses, productivity indicators, harvest pressure, and traditional ecological knowledge may be used in this assessment. The OPT described in 3.2 are a basis to make inferences related to assessment of future trend.

2.6 Historic Annual Removals

The average annual removals report and this generally include all human caused mortalities including DLPs, mortalities due to research, and mortalities due to human activities e.g. consumption of toxic materials related to development. This also includes removals to zoos where applicable.

2.7 Potential Maximum Removals

The annual total number of human-caused polar bear mortalities from a sub-population allowed under quota(s), Total Allowable Harvest, Total Allowable Take, and\or voluntary agreements. Potential maximum removals do not include credits applied for and approved under the flexible quota system in Nunavut.

3. **Historic Trend Assessment**

3.1 Steps to Assess Historic Trend

Compare current population estimate with the first documented and comparable historic population estimate. When a current estimate is directly comparable to an historic estimate, a designation without any qualifier (i.e. reduced, stable, or increased) may be used.

If the current estimate is not directly comparable to an historic estimate because of differences in study area, or methods, a comparison may be made but any assessment of changes in abundance are inferred. In this case, a qualifier is required (i.e. likely reduced, likely stable, or likely increased).

When population estimates cannot be compared, other lines of evidence such as the most recent population attributes of the sub-population (e.g. age structure) may be used to infer changes in the abundance of the sub-population. This does not include TEK. Again, a qualifier is required (i.e. likely reduced, likely stable, or likely increased).

When there is insufficient information or lack of confidence in available information to make an assessment of change in abundance, the sub-population is assessed as uncertain.

Additional text is provided in the comments section of the status table. It includes listing items such as major threats and other lines of evidence that may have been used.

3.2 Status Designations

Reduced	Current population estimate is statistically significantly lower than historic population estimate
Stable	Current population estimate is not different from historic population estimate
Increased	Current population estimate is statistically significantly higher than historic population estimate
Likely Reduced	Current or inferred current population abundance is lower than historic or inferred historic population abundance
Likely Stable	Current or inferred current population abundance is not different from historic or inferred historic population abundance
Likely Increased	Current or inferred current population abundance is higher than historic or inferred historic population abundance
Uncertain	Insufficient information or lack of confidence in available information to make an assessment

4. **TEK assessment**

4.1 Steps for TK-based Assessment of Status

Consider the observations, propositions, and theories ("OPT" – the bundle of elements that contribute to and constitute TK) of Traditional Knowledge Holders ("TKHs") to contribute to the assessment the current status of each management unit. Wherever possible the TK Assessment is based on the present to past 15-year timeframe, for consistency with the Recent Trend Column. However, given the nature of TK acquisition and transmission, the TK Assessment may extend beyond the most recent 15-year period, but within the lived experience and living memory of the TKHs. The OPT are a basis to make inferences related to assessment of future trend.

Assessment of status may include a full suite of population attributes collected from TKHs (e.g. population abundance, indicators of population productivity and viability, age, distribution, den locations, behaviour).

Compare the current TK-based population assessment of status with previous TK-based assessments (within a 10-20 year period). When a current assessment is directly comparable to a previous population assessment utilizing a consistent data collection protocol and methodology, a designation without any qualifier is made (i.e. reduced, stable or increased).

If the current assessment of status is not directly comparable to the previous population assessment because of differences in study area, population attributes, methods, or is outdated,

a comparison may still be made as the basis for inference. Changes from the previous assessment may include qualification (i.e. likely reduced, likely stable, or likely increased).

When there is insufficient information or lack of confidence in available information to make an assessment of changes in status, the sub-population is assessed as uncertain.

4.2 TK based trend assessment designations

Decline	There is a high degree of confidence that the current population status assessment is lower than previous population assessment
Stable	Current population status assessment is not different from previous population assessment
Increase	There is a high degree of confidence that the current population status assessment is higher than previous population assessment
Likely Decline	Current or inferred current population assessment is lower than previous or inferred previous population assessment
Likely Stable	Current or inferred current population assessment is not different from previous or inferred previous population assessment
Likely Increase	Current or inferred current population assessment higher than previous or inferred previous population assessment
Uncertain	Insufficient information or lack of confidence in available information to make an assessment

5. **Recent Trend Assessment**

5.1 Steps to Assess Recent Trend

Compare current population estimate with previous population estimate assuming current population estimate is appropriately recent. When a current estimate is directly comparable to its previous population estimate, a designation without any qualifier is made (i.e. reduced, stable, or increased).

If the current estimate is not directly comparable to its previous population estimate because of differences in study area, methods, or is outdated, and cannot be updated by PVA, a comparison may be made but any assessment of changes in recent population abundance are inferred and a qualifier is required (i.e. likely reduced, likely stable, or likely increased).

When population estimates cannot be compared or are not applicable to assess recent trend, other lines of evidence such as the most recent population attributes of the sub-population (e.g. age distribution) may be used to infer any changes in the abundance of the sub-population. This does not include TEK. Again, a qualifier is required (i.e. likely reduced, likely stable, or likely increased).

When there is insufficient information or lack of confidence in available information to make an assessment of changes in population abundance, the sub-population is assessed as uncertain.

Additional text is provided in the comments section of the status table. It includes listing items such as major threats and other lines of evidence that may have been used.

5.2 Recent Trend Designations

Declined	Population estimate is statistically significantly lower than previous population estimate
Stable	Current population estimate is not different from previous population estimate
Increased	Current population estimate is statistically significantly higher than previous population estimate
Likely Declined	Current or inferred current population abundance is lower than previous or inferred previous population abundance
Likely Stable	Current or inferred current population abundance is not different from previous or inferred previous population abundance
Likely Increased	Current or inferred current population abundance is higher than previous or inferred previous population abundance
Uncertain	Insufficient information or lack of confidence in available information to make an assessment

6. **Future Trend Assessment**

6.1 Steps to Assess Future Trend

Compare current population estimate with future population estimate but not exclusive to a population viability analysis (PVA). PVAs are considered in the assessment as long as the data derived vital rates used to generate the simulations are not older than 15 years. In all these cases, a qualifier is required (i.e. likely reduced, likely stable, or likely increased).

In addition to PVAs, other lines of evidence (e.g. body condition, litter size, sea ice trend, TEK) may be used to predict future trend of a sub-population.

When there is contradictory evidence, insufficient information or lack of confidence in available information to make an assessment of future changes in population abundance, the sub-population is assessed as uncertain.

Additional text is provided in the comments section of the status table. It includes listing items such as major threats and other lines of evidence that may have been used.

6.2 Future Trend Designations

Likely Decline	Future population abundance predicted to be lower than current population abundance
Likely Stable	Future population abundance predicted not to be different from current population abundance
Likely Increase	Future population abundance predicted to be higher than current population abundance
Uncertain	Contradictory evidence, insufficient information, or lack of confidence in available information to make an assessment

2017 PBTC Status Table

Subpopulation	Estimate	±2 SE or 95% CI	Year of Population Estimate	Method	Historic Trend	TEK Assessment	Recent Trend	Future Trend	Historic annual removal (5 yr mean)	Historic annual removal (3 yr mean)	Historical annual removal (2015/2016)	Potential Maximum Removals (2015-2016)	Comments/Vulnerabilities/Habitat	Jurisdiction
Baffin Bay	2,826	2059-3593	2012-13 [1]	GM\R	uncertain	stable[2]	likely stable[3]	uncertain[4]	139.4	132.7	136	132 (NU:65+GL:67)	cannot make direct comparison of previous (1997) and current estimate because of differences in geographical coverage and distribution of bears, high harvest; decline in sea ice; increased time spent on land; decline in body condition; reduced denning time; increased shipping, TK report currently being finalized	NU, GL
Davis Strait	2,158	1833-2542	2007 [5]	PM\R	likely increased	increased[6]	likely increase[7]	likely decline [8]	103.0	94.7	63	QC + 77 (NU:61+NL:13+GL:3)	potential for high harvest (currently managed in some jurisidictions for a decline); decline in sea ice; scheduled for reassessment beginning 2017	NU, QC, NL, GL
Foxe Basin	2,585	2096-3189	2009-10 [9]	A	stable	increased[10]	stable[11]	likely stable[12]	105.8	103.3	105	QC + 123	decline in sea ice; potential for increased shipping for mineral extraction	NU, QC
Gulf of Boothia	1,592	870-2314	2000 [13]	PM\R	likely stable	increasing[14]	uncertain [15]	likely stable [16]	64.0	61.3	65	74	Current and projected habitat change may affect productivity of ecosystem; subpopulation has high vital rates and low harvest; reassessment underway;	NU
Kane Basin	357	221-493	2013-14 [17]	GM\R	likely reduced	increasing[18]	increased[19]	likely stable [20]	6.8	7.3	11	11 (NU:5+GL:6)	small population; adult male survival 0.87 and female survival 0.95; changes in sea ice conditions(annual to seasonal sea ice); potential positive response to initial impacts of climate change and reduced harvest;	NU, GL
Lancaster Sound	2,541	1759-3323	1995-97 [21]	PM\R	likely stable	increasing[22]	uncertain[23]	uncertain [24]	88.0	85.3	91	85	historic sex-skewed harvest, habitat decline, potential for increased shipping for mineral extraction	NU
M'Clintock Channel	284	166-402	2000 [25]	PM\R	likely reduced	stable [26]	uncertain [27]	uncertain [28]	5.0	6.3	11	12	loss of multi-year ice; currently being reassessed	NU
Northern Beaufort Sea	1,291*	n/a	2006 [29]	PM\R	likely stable	stable [30]	likely stable[31]	likely stable [32]	43.8	39.3	49	77 (NU:6+ NWT:71)	decline in sea ice; TK study completed	NU, NWT
Norwegian Bay	203	115-291	1997 [33]	PM\R	uncertain	stable [34]	uncertain [35]	uncertain [36]	2.0	2.0	2	4	small, isolated population	NU
Southern Beaufort Sea	1,215* old boundary: 907	n/a old boundary: 548-1270	2006 [37] old boundary: 2010	PM\R	uncertain	stable [38]	likely declined[39]	likely decline [40]	35.2	25.0	28	56 (US:35 + ISR:21)	currently being assessed; sea ice declines; declines in body condition, growth and demographic parameters related to changing sea ice; analysis of data 2001-2010 indicated a decline in abundance through 2006 followed by a period of relative stability through 2010; changes in study area and annual sampling regime may have resulted in potential negative bias in recent estimate of abundance; eastern subpopulation boundary was adjusted in 2013/14; TK suggests that annual variability in ice conditions results in changes in density and that bears are shifting to NB because of ice conditions; potential for oil/gas development	US,ISR (YK, NWT)
Southern Hudson Bay	943	658-1350	2011-12 [41]	A	stable	stable James Bay; increased in East Hudson Bay [42]	stable [43]	uncertain[44]	46.2	40.7	41	45 (NU:20 + QC:24 + ON:1)	Uncertain due to contradictory lines of evidence: large declines of body condition; declines in survival rates yet no change in abundance; TEK indicates winter body condition has not changed; TEK indicates that reproductive rates have improved, TEK and science indicate changes in sea ice, ice free season increased by 30 days between 1980-2012. habitat decline; decline of permafrost-based denning habitat; currently being reassessed;	NU, QC, ON
Viscount Melville Sound	161	93-229	1992 [45]	PM\R	likely reduced	increased [46]	uncertain [47]	uncertain [48]	4.6	4.0	4	7(NU:3 +NWT:4)	currently being reassessed; data over 15 years old	NU, NWT
Western Hudson Bay	1,030	754-1406	2011 [49]	A	likely reduced	increased [50]	likely stable[51]	likely decline [52]	28.8	31.0	35	28 (NU) + MB	currently being reassessed; sea ice decline; declines in body condition and lower productivity compared to adjacent Foxe Basin and Southern Hudson Bay subpopulations; historic decline in abundance from late 1980s through late 1990s linked to reduced survival due to timing of sea ice breakup; analysis indicated relative stability in subpopulation from 2001-2010, a period during which there was no significant trend in sea ice freeze up or breakup; continued linkage between female survival and sea-ice conditions; MB harvest considered to be 8 by NWMB (2015)	MB, NU

Notes

PM/R - Physical Mark Recapture Survey
GM/R - Genetic Mark Recapture Survey
A - Aerial survey
n/a - not available
* The revised estimates for NB and SB are the result of a management boundary change. Revision is based on an analysis by Griswold et al. looking at impact of new boundary on M\R estimates.

2017 PBTC Status Table

2017 PBTC Status Table Footnotes

1. SWG. 2016
2. Born et al. 2011; Dowsley 2005a; Dowsley 2005b; Dowsley 2007; Dowsley and Taylor 2006; Nunavut Wildlife Management Board (NWMB) Public Hearing minutes and submissions for April 2008, September 2009;
3. SWG 2016
4. Vital rates for Riskman PVA are 20 years old; TEK indicates population is stable; there is current research and ongoing assessment
5. Peacock et al. 2013
6. Kotierk 2010a, 2010b; York et al. 2015 recoginzing spatial limitations of work restricted to Labrador.
7. Peacock et al. 2013; Stirling 1980.
8. The impact of a TAH increase on the population has not been modeled; predicted trend after survey was completed at harvest levels in 2007 was considered stable (Peacock et al. 2013); NWMB Davis Strait public hearing submissions May 16-17, 2011
9. Stapleton et al. 2016
10. Sahanatien pers com. 7 Feb 2013; Dyck pers com. 7 Feb 2013; Canadian Wildlife Service Nunavut consultation report 2009
11. Taylor et al 2006b; Stapleton et al. 2016
12. Stapleton et al. 2016
13. Taylor et al. 2009
14. Keith et al. 2005; Canadian Wildlife Service Nunavut consultation report 2009
15. For the period 2000–2015, assuming all sources of removals in the population sum to 74 bears/yr, the population can be expected to persist at a stable population size (Taylor et al. 2009)
16. Hunters in area reporting ice conditions have improved productivity, harvest levels remain stable (Dyck pers com. 2013)
17. SWG. 2016
18. Canadian Wildlife Service Nunavut consultation report 2009
19. SWG. 2016
20. SWG. 2016
21. Schwinsburg et al. 1980; Taylor et al. 2006; Taylor et al. 2008
22. Canadian Wildlife Service Nunavut consultation report 2009
23. For the period 1997-2012, the population would be expected to be stable under the historical harvest regimen (1993-97). At the mean harvest rate of 78 bears/yr (2002-2006), and based on a PVA, we estimate that the population is more likely to decline than to increase (Taylor et al. 2008). Current harvest rate should also lead to decline, but no recent vital rates have been collected to update the PVA
24. Vital rates for Riskman PVA are 20 years old
25. Taylor et al. 2006a
26. Inuit report that bears are moving to neighbouring areas throughout the region. (Keith et al. 2005; CWS Nunavut consultation report 2009)
27. Likely an increase based on quantitative assessment of growth rate (Taylor et al. 2006a)
28. Vital rates for PVA are 20 years old; several research planning consultations has been completed; further consultations ongoing.
29. Griswold et al. 2010; Stirling et al. 2011
30. Joint Secretariat. 2015
31. Population size used for management was historically adjusted to 1,200 due to bias in in population estimate (Amstrup et al. 2005; Stirling et al. 2011).
32. Durner et al. 2009, Stirling et al. 2011, and Joint Secretariat 2015 indicate stable population and habitat conditions may improve in short-term
33. Taylor et al. 2006; Taylor et al. 2008
34. Canadian Wildlife Service Nunavut consultation report 2009
35. Vital rates for Riskman PVA are 20 years old and vital rates were substituted from other populations (Taylor et al 2008); no recent work in the area
36. Vital rates for Riskman PVA are 20 years old and vital rates were substituted from other populations (Taylor et al. 2008)
37. Griswold et al., 2010; USGS 2010
38. Joint Secretariat. 2015
39. Population estimate is lower but not statistically different from previous population estimates (Amstrup et al. 1986, Regehr et al. 2006). Quotas were based on the understanding that the total harvest of independent females would not exceed the modelled sustainable maximimum of 1.5% of the population (Taylor et al. 1987) and that a 2:1 ratio of males to females would be maintained in the total quota harvested (Stirling 2002)
40. Based on sea ice declines (Durner et al 2009), changes in body conditions measured in Alaska (Rode et al. 2010) and modelling (Regehr et al. 2010). Estimated risk of future decline is based on vital rates estimated from 2001-2006 data used in demographic models that incorporate sea ice forecasts.
41. Obbard et al. 2015
42. NMRWB Public Hearing Inukjuak February 2014
43. Based on comparison with previous subpopulation estimates (Obbard et al. 2013; Obbard 2008; Kolenosky 1994).
44. Body condition decline, vital rate declines and changes in ice conditions; Inuit observations show no decline in body condition or abundance (Obbard et al. 2016, Obbard et al. 2015, Obbard et al. 2016, NMRWB, unpublished)
45. Taylor et al. 2002
46. Canadian Wildlife Service Nunavut consultation report 2009; community consultations in 2012 and 2013
47. Harvest managed for population growth since last survey including a 5 year moratorium; comparable litter size in 2012 (GNWT unpublished)
48. Vital rates for Riskman PVA are 25 years old; population reassessment currently in process
49. Stapleton et al. 2014; see Lunn et al. 2016 mark recapture estimate
50. Canadian Wildlife Service Nunavut consultation report 2009, Kotierk 2012, NWMB Public Hearing minutes 2005; Tyrrell 2006
51. Lunn et al. 2016
52. Based on body condition, abundance estimates, reduced reproductive productivity, and changes in ice conditions (Stirling and Parkinson 2006, Stapleton et al. 2014, Lunn pers com.)

Appendix 1 – 2017 PBTC Status References

Amstrup, S.C., Durner, G.M., Stirling, I., and McDonald, T.L. 2005. Allocating harvests among polar bear stocks in the Beaufort Sea. *Arctic* 58:247–259.

Amstrup, S.C., Stirling, I., and Lentfer, J.W. 1986. Past and present status of polar bears in Alaska. *Wildlife Society Bulletin* 14:241–254.

Born, E.W., Heilmann, A. Holm, L.K., and Laidre, K.L. 2011. Polar bears in Northwest Greenland: an interview survey about the catch and the climate. Monographs on Greenland, Man and Society Volume 41. Museum Tusculanum Press, University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Denmark.

Bromaghin, J.F., McDonald, T.L., Stirling, I., Derocher, A.E., Richardson, E.S., Regehr, E.V., Douglas, D.C., Durner, G.M., Atwood, T., and Amstrup, S.C. 2015. Polar bear population dynamics in the southern Beaufort Sea during a period of sea ice decline. *Ecological Applications* 25:634–651.

Canadian Wildlife Service. 2009. Nunavut consultation report – Consultations on the proposed listing of the Polar Bear as Special Concern under the Species at Risk Act. Report submitted to the Nunavut Wildlife Management Board in accordance with Step 3.8 of the Memorandum of Understanding to Harmonize the Designation of Endangered Species under the *Nunavut Land Claims Agreement* and the *Species at Risk Act*, 249 pp. [available at: http://assembly.nu.ca/library/Edocs/2009/001149-e.pdf].

Dowsley, M. 2005. Inuit knowledge regarding climate change and the Baffin Bay polar bear population. Government of Nunavut, Department of Environment, Final Wildlife Report 1, Department of Environment, Government of Nunavut, Iqaluit, Nunavut, Canada, 43 pp.

Dowsley, M. 2007. Inuit perspectives on polar bears (*Ursus maritimus*) and climate change in Baffin Bay, Nunavut, Canada. *Research and Practice in Social Sciences* 2:53–74.

Dowsley, M., and Taylor, M.K. 2006. Community consultations with Qikiqtarjuaq, Clyde River and Pond Inlet on management concerns for the Baffin Bay (BB) polar bear population: a summary of Inuit

knowledge and community consultations. Final Wildlife Report 2, Department of Environment, Government of Nunavut, Iqaluit, Nunavut, Canada, 83 pp.

Durner, G.M., Douglas, D.C., Nielson, R.M., Amstrup, S.C., McDonald, T.L., Stirling, I., Mauritzen, M., Born, E.W., Wiig, Ø., DeWeaver, E., Serreze, M.C., Belikov, S.E., Holland, M.M., Maslanik, J., Aars, J., Bailey, D.A., and Derocher, A.E. 2009. Predicting 21st-century polar bear habitat distribution from global climate models. *Ecological Monogaphs* 79:25–58.

Griswold, J., McDonald, T., Branigan, M., Regehr, E., and Amstrup, S. 2010 Southern and Northern Beaufort Sea polar bear population estimates under a proposed boundary shift. Unpublished report, Government of the NWT, Inuvik, NWT, Canada, 33 pp.

Joint Secretariat. 2015. Inuvialuit and Nanuq: A Polar Bear Traditional Knowledge Study. Joint Secretariat, Inuvialuit Settlement Region, Inuvik, NWT, Canada, xx + 304 pp.

Keith, D., Arqvik, J., Kamookak, L., and Ameralik, J. 2005. *Inuit Qaujimaningit Nanurnut: Inuit Knowledge of Polar Bears.* Gjoa Haven Hunters and Trappers and CCI Press, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada.

Kolenosky, G.B., Abraham, K.F., and Greenwood, C.J. 1992. Polar bears of southern Hudson Bay. Polar bear project, 1984 - 88. Final Report, Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources, Ontario, Canada, 107 pp.

Kotierk, M. 2010*a*. Elder and hunter knowledge of Davis Strait polar bears, climate change and Inuit participation. Department of Environment, Government of Nunavut, Igloolik, Nunavut, Canada, 23 pp.

Kotierk, M. 2010*b*. The documentation of Inuit and public knowledge of Davis Strait polar bears, climate change, Inuit Knowledge and environmental management using public opinion polls. Department of Environment, Government of Nunavut, Iqaluit, Nunavut, Canada, 96 pp.

Kotierk, M. 2012. Public and Inuit interests, Western Hudson Bay polar bears and wildlife management: results of a public opinion poll in western Hudson Bay communities. Department of

Environment, Government of Nunavut, Iqaluit, Nunavut, Canada, 55 pp.

Lunn, N.J., Servanty, S., Regehr, E.V., Converse, S.J., Richardson, E., and Stirling, I. 2016. Demography of an apex predator at the edge of its range – impacts of changing sea ice on polar bears in Hudson Bay. *Ecological Applications* 26:1302–1320.

Obbard, M.E. 2008. Southern Hudson Bay polar bear project 2003–2005: final report. Unpublished report, Wildlife Research and Development Section, Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources, Peterborough, Ontario, Canada, 64 pp.

Obbard, M.E., Cattet, M.R.L., Howe, E.J., Middel, K.R., Newton, E.J., Kolenosky, G.B., Abraham, K.F., and Greenwood, C.J. 2016. Trends in body condition in polar bears (*Ursus maritimus*) from the Southern Hudson Bay subpopulation in relation to changes in sea ice. *Arctic Science* 2:15–32.

Obbard, M.E., Stapleton, S., Middell, K.R., Thibault, I., Brodeur, V., and Jutras, C. 2015. Estimating the abundance of the Southern Hudson Bay polar bear subpopulation with aerial surveys. *Polar Biology* 38:1713–1725.

Peacock, E., Taylor, M.K., Laake, J., and Stirling, I. 2013. Population ecology of polar bears in Davis Strait, Canada and Greenland. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 77*:*463–476.

Regehr, E.V., Amstrup, S.C., and Stirling, I. 2006. Polar bear population status in the southern Beaufort Sea. U.S. Geological Survey Administrative Report, U.S. Department of the Interior, Reston, Virginia, USA, 20 pp.

Regehr, E.V., Hunter, C.M., Caswell, H., Amstrup, S.C., and Stirling, I. 2010. Survival and breeding of polar bears in the southern Beaufort Sea in relation to sea ice. *Journal of Animal Ecology* 79:117–127.

Rode, K.D., Amstrup, S.C., and Regehr, E.V. 2010. Reduced body size and cub recruitment in polar bears associated with sea ice decline. *Ecological Applications* 20:768–782.

Sciullo, L., Thiemann, G.W., and Lunn, N.J. 2016. Comparative assessment of metrics for monitoring the body condition of polar bears in Western Hudson Bay. *Journal of Zoology* 300:45–58.

SWG [Scientific Working Group to the Canada-Greenland Joint Commission on Polar Bear]. 2016. Re-Assessment of the Baffin Bay and Kane Basin Polar Bear Subpopulations: Final Report to the Canada-Greenland Joint Commission on Polar Bear, x + 636 pp.

Stapleton, S., Atkinson, S., Hedman, D., and Garshelis, D. 2014. Revisiting Western Hudson Bay: Using aerial surveys to update polar bear abundance in a sentinel population. *Biological Conservation* 170:38–47.

Stapleton, S., Peacock, E., and Garshelis, D. 2016. Aerial surveys suggest long-term stability in the seasonally ice-free Foxe Basin (Nunavut) polar bear population. *Marine Mammal Science* 32:181–201.

Stirling, I. 2002. Polar bears and seals in the eastern Beaufort Sea and Amundsen Gulf: A synthesis of population trends and ecological relationships over three decades. *Arctic* 55:59–76.

Stirling, I., and Parkinson, C. L. 2006. Possible effects of climate warming on selected populations of polar bears (*Ursus maritimus*) in the Canadian Arctic. *Arctic* 59:261–275.

Stirling, I., Calvert, W., and Andriashek, D. 1980. Population ecology studies of the polar bear in the area of southeastern Baffin island. Canadian Wildlife Service Occasional Paper No. 44, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada, 30 pp.

Stirling, I., McDonald, T.L., Richardson, E.S., Regehr, E.V., and Amstrup, S.C. 2011. Polar bear population status in the northern Beaufort Sea, Canada, 1971–2006. *Ecological Applications* 21:859–876.

Taylor, M.K., DeMaster, D.P., Bunnell, F.L., and Schweinsburg, R.E. 1987. Modeling the sustainable harvest of polar bears. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 51:811–820.

Taylor, M.K., Laake, J., Cluff, H.D., Ramsay, M., and Messier, F. 2002. Managing the risk from hunting for the Viscount Melville Sound polar bear population. *Ursus* 13:185–202.

Taylor, M.K., Laake, J., McLoughlin, P.D., Cluff, H.D., and Messier, F. 2006*a*. Demographic parameters and harvest-explicit population viability analysis for polar bears in M'Clintock Channel, Nunavut,

Canada. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 70:1667–1673.

Taylor, M.K., Laake, J., McLoughlin, P.D., Cluff, H.D., and Messier, F. 2008. Mark-recapture and stochastic population models for polar bears of the high Arctic. *Arctic* 61:143–152.

Taylor, M.K., Laake, J., McLoughlin, P.D., Cluff, H.D., and Messier, F. 2009. Demography and population viability of polar bears in the Gulf of Boothia, Nunavut. *Marine Mammal Science* 25:778–796.

Taylor, M.K., Lee, J., Laake, J., and McLoughlin, P.D. 2006*b*. Estimating population size of polar bears in Foxe Basin, Nunavut using tetracycline biomarkers. File Report, Department of Environment, Government of Nunavut, Igloolik, Nunavut, Canada, 13 pp.

Tyrrell, M. 2006. More bears, less bears: Inuit and scientific perceptions of polar bear populations on the west coast of Hudson Bay. *Journal of Inuit Studies* 30:191–208.

USFWS. 2010. Polar bear (*Ursus maritimus*): Southern Beaufort Sea Stock. Final Polar Bear Stock Assessment Report. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Marine Mammals Management, Anchorage, Alaska, USA. http://alaska.fws.gov/fisheries/mmm/polarbear/reports.htm.

York, J., Dowsley, M., Cornwell, A., Kuc, M., and Taylor, M. 2016. Demographic and traditional knowledge perspectives on the current status of Canadian polar bear subpopulations. *Ecology and Evolution* doi: 10.1002/ece3.2030.