

To Dr. Janez Potočnik

Commissioner for the Environment

B-1049 Brussels, Belgium

janez.potocnik@ec.europa.eu

Infringement process Swedish wolf

Dear Commissioner Janez Potočnik.

The infringement process the EU commission initiated is: disproportionate; harms all parties; unjust; with no end in sight; unscientific; feels like a fundamentalist and populist power demonstration. Please, put an end to the EU infringement process in a smooth and fast way to the benefit of us all! A governmental investigation on coexistence with wolf (SOU 2013:60) has recently been published. This investigation has got a positive response, including the major stakeholders involved "on both sides". This short and fragile time window could be used to finish the process. It was quickly followed by a Governmental proposal to Parliament (12/13:191), which included the statement that a favourable conservation status have been reached for wolf. Please, do not derail this process!

I am a retired genetic professor, and interested in wolves mainly because of the frequent and common misuse of genetics in the Swedish wolf debate. The improvement of the genetic status of the wolf is faster and greater when the population is kept small and culled by selective hunting. The EU involvement counteracts this Swedish priority. The wolf gets a better genetic status without the EU!! In the following I consider the EU influence more in detail and also beyond the genetics.

Signature: Umeå 2013-09-19 Dag Lindgren, Professor emeritus – Forest Genetics,
contact: Dag.Lindgren@gronstene.se

Trust the Swedish intention to follow the directive!

All major organisations in Sweden agree that the directive should be followed, including all political parties. It seems unfair to use a language implying that this is not understood. Sweden has among the largest populations in EU of bear, lynx and wolverine. The Swedish populations of all large carnivores (including wolves) have grown tremendously to well-established seemingly sustainable levels.

The Swedish wolf population has grown from zero to around 420 (early 2014) in a little more than three decades. Huge resources and much attention have been allocated to the Swedish wolf program. Thousands of qualified documents have been produced over the last years. Wolf-connected research, investigations and development get a much larger share of resources than other comparable matters. Sweden considers itself to be a well working parliamentary democracy, which - in comparison to most other states - is honest; non-corrupt; scientifically competent and able to keep matters under reasonable governmental control. Your actions contribute to ruin that picture. Sweden deserves credit for harbouring huge number of carnivores and for bringing the wolf from extinction to a viable population. Instead EU deals with Sweden as a suspected criminal because of differences in opinion on exactly *how* viable the wolf population is.

Sweden claims its interpretation of the directive is correct.

You (partly supported by the Commission) have had different views than Sweden on some points. That does not mean that you are right on all points. Some points, where you may be right, do not justify delaying the process. On many points there is still no evidence of right or wrong answers. This is a dispute about interpretation of matters, which are difficult and have considerable subjective elements.

The Finnish wolf has had its infringement process in the EU court. The court followed the Finnish opinion on three points and the EU opinion on one (Finland won with 3-1). Thus the EU court may not share your opinions. But the best solution for both you and Sweden must be the finding that Sweden is now on the right track and that the dispute has been settled.

When two have different opinions, seldom only one is wrong

The Swedish Government states that they have done what is in their power to meet your demands. But you and your staff seem to claim that Sweden has failed to meet your demands and repeating the threat to bring the matter to the EU-court. Both parties claim frequent discussions on different levels. Even the latest investigation (Egardt) has been carried out in contact with your staff and seems to conclude that Egardt's suggestions are in principle agreeable to you. With disagreements – when both parties honestly want to agree - there is usually a complex web of reasons making full understanding difficult, this has nothing to do with just incompetence and bad will of one of the sides. It is usually not a good strategy to humiliate one party. Politicians are usually better at handling these types of

conflicts unlike what has happened so far in this conflict. Please, when you consider the Swedish proposition take into account that it seems very likely that the problem lies not only on the Swedish side. I suggest to you to seriously reconsider your position in that hypothetical case.

EU can trust that the Swedish juridical system will safeguard that EU-directive will be stringently interpreted from a legal perspective

. Swedish courts have recently considered the wolf problems. It was decided that concerned NGO organisations could appeal wolf decisions in court. That probably means that every wolf hunted will result in a court case in the foreseeable future. The courts concluded that a rather high fraction of all wolf hunts have been inhibited or finally found illegal. With so many decided wolf-hunts disapproved, EU should now trust that the Swedish juridical system feels competent to handle possible violations with the stringent rules of the directive by the Swedish Legal System. Even if some court decisions are not final, still it demonstrates the strictness of the process. The very strict surveillance by EU in the form of a hanging infringement process seems no longer justified.

The trustworthiness of the Powers of the State Sweden is soon ruined

The **Parliament** decided in 2009 that A) Sweden halts wolf growth on a temporary target of 200 wolves the years ahead, and initiate a process to identify a final minimum target after that. This decision had a massive support in parliament. B) Culling should be initiated.

The political parties behind the massive majority decision have kept their desires about some hundred wolves unaffected till the proposition. A) There are around 420 wolves early 2014 and no confirmed decision about a new minimum target (FRP) has appeared. B) No controlled culling seems possible.

The **Government** decided in August 2011 to stop the 2012 hunt (overruling the Parliament). The Government seemed to advocate more protective hunt instead, while anticipating that the problems with EU would be solved within about a year. The priority was said to be to get the infringement process away from the agenda as fast as possible. The Government stated that they had intensive contacts and cooperation with your staff on the matter. The Government expressed worries that the wolf question would remain with EU. The Government claimed repeatedly that it has done what you required. However, the matter has not been settled for more than two years, while the Government thought that only one year would be needed. No hunt was allowed in 2013 besides a skydds jakt (derogation), which was more restricted than anticipated.

Naturvårdsverket (the Swedish Environment Protection Agency, "SEPA", "EPA", the Swedish authority dealing with wolf matters) is nowadays responsible for A) updating the "Förvaltningsplan för varg" (Management plan); B) reporting about the current status of wolf

to EU in June 2013; C) the wolf hunt. Nothing of this has functioned well: A) No update of the management plan has been done. The complement presented last autumn did not stand the “scientific scrutiny” requested by the commissioner at an expert meeting on 26/4 at Naturvårdsverket. None of the assumptions it was based on seem fulfilled. Probably it can be regarded as withdrawn; B) No opinion about the conservation state was expressed to EU; C) A selective hunt (harvesting) early 2013 was inhibited by the court. Several other measures decided upon by Naturvårdsverket have been stopped by the court.

--. There is one lesson the Swedish people have learnt about wolves: neither Government; nor Parliament; nor Naturvårdsverket can be trusted as their decisions are not reliable. This has a large general negative impact. The possible gain of marginally better wolf rules and Sweden becoming more observant to its obligations to EU seem too small a benefit to compensate.

You may argue that the effects are restricted to wolves and are short term, but with your prolonged demands and requests in spite of efforts to please you, the effects are much wider and long-lasting. You have with your advice and threats of court action undermined the ability of Sweden to make decisions. Please, do not prolong this process for years to come!

You, your instructions and your collaborators have been unable to clarify what is required.

DG environment has had frequent contact with the Swedes most involved in different proposals. The main investigator about wolf – Liljelund - (SOU 2012:22), former head of Naturvårdsverket - suggested a favourable reference population, which should be approached slowly over a period of twelve years. Evidently he was (like our Government) not informed or did not believe in the strictness of the EU-rules. Even a small trimming of the stem was immediately prevented early in 2013. “Naturvårdsverket” has recently got many of their hunt decisions inhibited, as Courts found them illegal. A complete management plan including prerequisites for favourable conservation status has not been written. These events strongly indicate that EU officers have been unable to communicate important information on EU-rules to important decision makers.

Earlier (2011) Swedish ministers wrote to you about socioeconomic aspects and how to deal with them, and you replied that the directive had all the flexibility needed for management of the large carnivores considering local, social and economic conditions. Actions should consider economic, social and cultural needs including regional and local conditions. Your staff seems to have failed to instruct Sweden how this should be applied. The latest investigation (Egardt SOU 2013:60) focuses on these considerations. These matters have been discussed with your staff. It seems from Egardt’s briefing that most of his suggestions are agreeable to EU and can be implemented.

After the Governmental proposition was presented, immediately the major environmental groups claimed that the Government intended to kill more than half of all the Swedish wolves this winter. They falsely assumed that the Government set the number in an interval on subjective grounds. It is Naturvårdsverket who sets FRP in a way considering scientific based knowledge and opinions. This idea with intervals was suggested at an enquiry where all stakeholders were represented and no severe criticism was evident. They also falsely assumed that the highest favourable reference population number was the maximum number of wolves. My understanding is that the EU-Commission strongly objects to a maximum number and Sweden follows the Commissioner's wish, no limit is given; even if that would be useful for giving the impression of National control, increase of acceptance and even for transparency. You can see Sweden is obedient to your wishes and makes it harder to get wolf policy accepted to please you! The number of wolves hunted the next years will certainly not bring their number near the minimum allowable. The strong critic against the proposition proposals is partly caused by the impossibility to explain the very complicated non-transparent concepts the EU uses. The EU must evaluate and take account of that part of this critic is caused by misunderstandings. These misunderstandings are not trivial. I do understand the problem of simplifying things, but the EU must understand and accept that many unfair statements like that "Sweden does not care for the wolves" is an EU caused perception.

The Sweden decision process is to a large extent open to everyone and the most important stakeholders are involved in the process

You emphasize the need of an open process transparent to all stakeholders, as if you thought that this was not the case. The Swedish wolf has during the three preceding years been the subject of three Governmental investigations (SOU 2011:37; SOU 2012:22; SOU 2013:60). Everyone is allowed to make public comments to these, and everyone can read what others have written. The major players are encouraged (or for specific public institutions forced) to comment. The current version of the management plan has been presented in a preliminary version exposed to evaluations from stakeholders and the public. Naturvårdsverket had a public web discussion about different issues aiming at better understanding of co-existence. In the media wolves attract as much attention as nuclear power and climate development. This debate is in articles, blogs, Facebook discussions, TV etc. The latest governmental investigation started two years ago, and all major stakeholders met many times. Sweden seems to make honest efforts to instigate open discussion and main stakeholders are involved. Your advice on the matter seems not needed.

EU actions cause large turmoil in Sweden

The minister failing in the initial contacts with you (Carlsgren) was replaced partly because of this failure. The current responsible minister (Lena Ek) represents a small party ("Centerpartiet"), which by your actions may cease to exist. It is within your powers to keep

the conflict boiling till elections next year. Making the responsible minister appear like a lame duck may bring "Centerpartiet" over the brink of vanishing as a party represented in parliament. The Chief of the main hunter organisation (Mörner) was involuntary replaced last year, because he was found too permissive in this wolf issue. This large hunter organisation has lost many members to a smaller competing hunter organisation, which was expected to make loader priority to few wolves. Efforts to start a new political party under the motto "no wolves" seem, however, to have failed, but not died. Naturvårdsverket has not been able to fulfil its expected functions. You may not fully realize the magnitude of the impact you have on the Swedish society.

Egardt's investigation made an effort to analyse the "costs and benefits" of wolf from a socioeconomic perspective. The main "benefit" of wolf is the feeling of the people that the number is "enough" to satisfy what is "needed". The negative impact of your repeated dissatisfaction does not support a feeling that the "enough" stage is near. According to the figures of this - of course rather speculative - study, the cost of the dissatisfaction you have caused is of the magnitude one billion crowns (hundred million Euros). There is little extra benefit (in this socioeconomic perspective) from more wolves than "enough".

The EU-rules seem to lead to results which are not scientifically trustworthy

There are convincing arguments that many thousands of wolves are needed for survival of the species. But the scientific logic for the conclusion that Sweden needs 700 or more wolves is less convincing. Very large numbers of wolves required for long time survival are calculated based on an assumption that genes from the east never reach Sweden and that where is a wolf-tight wall at Russian Karelia making Norway, Sweden, Finland and the border area to Russia functioning as an isolated island. That is not the case: wolves immigrate over that border. It seems contra-intuitive that Sweden should be completely broken off from the main part of the wolf distribution. Wolf distribution patterns are dynamic and changes within decades, predictions about the situation during coming centuries is highly uncertain. Wolves had a continuous distribution over Northern Europe, and individual wolves can and do move more than thousand kilometres between birth and death. The accumulated distance over many generations is larger. Sweden has a satisfactory genetic link to the east. Wolf genes can move arbitrary distances with translocations, thus the area the Swedish wolf gene pool is based on can be made arbitrary large. My point is that 700 wolves or more are often claimed to be based on Science in contrast to lower numbers. But speculation seems a more adequate description than Science for the high number suggestions.

Selective hunt, which doubles the effect of immigration and is an effective way of increasing genetic variation and decreasing inbreeding does not seem compatible with the EU-directive. That is the contrary to "scientifically based". Neither the justification for low number, nor that those lead to faster genetic improvement, seem acceptable by EU. It is

double standards and non-scientific to say that inbreeding is a great problem, while rejecting ways to handle it.

It is unfair to choose Sweden as main target

The wolf status gives more reason for concern in Sweden's closest neighbours (Norway, Finland, and Denmark), so why choose Sweden to pick at? Sweden has more large carnivores than any EU country for all species except wolf, where Sweden still is above average. EU had an infringement process against Finland a number of years ago and since that the wolf situation in Finland has become worse, but it is unclear if the relationship is causal. When Sweden suddenly doubles its wolf population, irritation in Finland and Norway will follow.

You harm the attitude of Sweden towards the EU

Most Swedes believe the Swedish wolf had survived without your attention. They believe that there are more important environmental problems than wolves, which could benefit more from EU's focus with less harm to Sweden. The EU involvement harms the Swedish political system severely, and this is not the kind of behaviour and demonstration of power of an EU that most Swedes want. In future the wisdom of the EU commission could get less trust and support from Sweden. The EU may have earned credit from some minor fractions in the Swedish society, but once the wolf leaves the agenda, these fractions will soon find another target; it is not a lasting credit. Besides the effects within Sweden, how Sweden is dealt with by the EU concerning wolf will encourage Norway to keep its distance from the EU.

EU misuses genetics in a way, which harms the respect for the subject genetics

I am a retired professor of forest genetics. What I find most annoying with EU and the wolf-procedure, is the repeated misuse of genetics in the debate. EU worries too much about which measures should be taken to improve the genetic status of the wolf, but is at the same time uninterested in the science about improving this genetic status. The current genetic status is acceptable (according to the opinion recently expressed by 11 Scientists) for classification as favourable conservation status. The genetic status will improve by itself with the current rate of natural immigration and there is no reason to deny favourable conservation status. Actually, the MVP values consider the current inbreeding and would be slightly lower if inbreeding was considered, as inbreeding will be lower in the future than now.

But, it is a good idea to improve the genetic status further. I find your actions to delay the improvement of the genetic status very disturbing. It seems an anti-scientific and bureaucratic attitude. One of the major reasons I got myself engaged in this wolf debate was to introduce a scientific consideration regarding how to reduce inbreeding in an efficient

way. The management focus should be more on *quality* of the wolves instead of high *quantity* of wolves!!

You repeat like a mantra that there is no disagreement on the present “unfavourable conservation state” of the Swedish wolf. But this agreement was only that the Swedish conservation state was not well documented by an authorised authority. Your talk about agreement does not seem honest. Now it will soon be documented by parliament that the conservation state is favourable. This is probably valid for some past years also. If you react acidly, the result will be that the planned culling in 2014 will be stopped and the chaos will remain. It is serious matter to claim the Swedish parliament wrong on an issue considered for several years.

A decision stating that the wolf now has favourable conservation status is urgently needed to reach desirable low inbreeding levels. Such a decision has been suggested by the Swedish Government to the Swedish Parliament. Many would find it highly unfortunate if you disturbed this process with non-appreciating comments. Selective hunting must be made possible in accordance with the stringent EU-rules. A low favourable reference population is highly desirable to speed up the improvement of the genetic status. It is imperative to consider genetics. This *is* the essence of considering genetics, when setting up the requirements for favourable conservation status.

My opinion is that the genetic status of the wolf would have been better today, if EU had not interfered, but accepted the Swedish parliament decision 2009. The EU involvement was not helpful.

Effective immigrants improve the genetic status. Both the number and the penetrance of immigrants have effects on the genetic status. Current natural immigration is sufficient according to the EU-directive and is enough to improve the genetic status. Natural immigration assisted by some translocations of wolf couples established in northern Sweden has been successfully applied (the Tiveden wolves) and now the assisted natural immigration seems enough for considerable improvement of genetic status.

Translocations to wild dens or fenced areas are depending on local acceptance. You have counteracted the Swedish efforts to create acceptance by linking the translocations to locally fewer and nationally controlled wolf number. In contrast, the concept “genetic valuable” has become a dirty word, as it is closely associated with more wolves in the local neighbourhood and an argument against removing problem wolves. You have contributed to ending the translocation program and thus slowing down the reduction of inbreeding.

The penetrance of immigrants is smaller the larger the population grows. The fresh immigrant genes get more diluted in large populations. Current free growth is no good idea and will tend to conserve the current inbreeding.

Genetically selective hunt means to cull the wolves whose gene mass dominate the population and spare the carriers of genes with a small representation in the population (mainly descendants of recent immigrants). In popular fashion this means that you cull the inbred and spare the genetic valuable, although it is more complicated than that. By applying selective hunt the effect of an immigrant is roughly doubled, thus the genes from the immigrants in 2008 get better represented in the population. The quota hunts 2010 and 2011 were selective, no single genetic valuable wolf was harvested, and the hunts slightly improved the genetic status of the current wolf population by increasing the proportion of descendants from recent immigrants.

It seems you do not understand that selective hunting boosts the effect of recent immigration. It would be possible to improve the genetic status three times faster in the absence of EUs involvement with its regrettable lack of interest to the scientific arguments concerning genetic status.

Those who suggest large numbers make subjective assumptions about the distant future. Assumptions like that there exists an iron curtain for wolves between Karelia and the rest of Russia, which will stay fixed in the coming millennia. It ought to be enough to know that there is a manifold higher number in Europe than needed in a very long time perspective. Far reaching implications of current data on current connectedness over large distances for wolf should be avoided the next decade. There is an unfortunate difficulty in seeing the difference between the management required for the short terms needs of a fast genetic recovery and the possible needs for coming millennia, which can be given higher attention in some decennia. The demographic PVA has been criticised if considered in isolation. Too much attention has focused on semantic analyses of what "much above" means and how needed it is, instead of looking at the partly scientific and partly subjective reasons. Other so called genetic PVA has been presented which also can be criticised if considered in isolation. All isolated presentation of individual numeric PVA in the Swedish debate can be seen as misuse of genetics. Choice of FRP should be discussed in a more holistic perspective. But I support that the whole range of FRP in the interval 170-270. All are acceptable, and would remain so also after a more complete FRP analyses.

The EU is on the wrong track giving priority to scientific scrutiny instead of common sense. Science is often difficult to interpret. Scientists think in terms of a model and their results may not be applicable outside the model. To make models researchable the factors influencing the model must be kept low. When Science meets reality one discovers that there are many traps; the enthusiastic scientists often miss them. Science MUST be combined with common sense, and this is not so common when the prerequisites for hunt and favourable conservation status of Swedish wolf are concerned.

It is hypocritical of EU to claim that the managements plan and favourable conservation status must be scientifically based and at the same time deny Sweden to use scientific principles for the Swedish wolf management to improve the genetic status.

An example may be the difficulties Naturvårdsverket experienced in formulating the requirement of FRP as a function of immigration. In this case, a model was used which was unfit to application just for the case of the Swedish wolves; with as result that the Naturvårdsverket got stuck and could not fulfil their obligations to make the six year report about the status of wolf to you. That's a result of believing in Science without applying common sense. But on the other hand you must realise that this is the sort of things which happens when overemphasizing scientific scrutiny in the belief that it can replace common sense.

EU-rules may force wolf number increase even when the numbers are far above what is required

Favourable conservation status requires more than a number. If Sweden considers it necessary to get a considerable lower level of inbreeding than today as was suggested by Liljelund, the current status will not be favourable for the coming decades. Over that time wolf numbers can then increase to thousands if quota hunting is not allowable. Or, the conservation status may not be seen favourable, if no family group exists in northern Sweden. Certainly frustrations will occur when the problem this creates is detected. Hopefully Sweden will be able to handle these problems by itself, but not if all details are scrutinized by a stringent and suspicious EU commission. EU did not tolerate earlier hunts executed or started with aim of reducing inbreeding faster. (In contrast the risk of reducing inbreeding slower is used as a reason to stop decided skydds jakt. Even well above the bottom number, the wolf is still a highly protected species and EU directives may not allow "quota hunt" to keep numbers close to the limit. If the reasons to avoid hunting in such circumstances seem to origin from statements from the EU directorate, the blame will fall on EU. But if EU stops interfering, it will be Sweden's problem and will cause less friction with the EU.

This Xmas the wolf number in Sweden will considerable exceed the FRP, but very likely the population will still increase and be considerable higher than last winter, because of the effects of the restrictions you have already introduced, even if you should stop with negative comments. Of course added negative comments will force the wolf population still higher above FRP.

The EU-directorate tends to forget what expression the EU-directorate makes and the consequences that this may have

There are signs which may be interpreted that the directorate is on the wolf side.

The spokesman for the Swedish EU delegation had the Phantom as Facebook face (The Phantom fights evil together with his wolf, "Devil").

The main responsible for the juridical wolf contacts with Sweden had a wolf head as "head" at Facebook.

Sometimes it is argued from Swedish administrators that if Sweden does not obey your instructions, it may lead to that EU takes over wolf management (or even all carnivore management) forbidding hunt for several years, while the EU-court works with it. I do not know if this is realistic speculations or not.

When you suggest referees to Lena Ek for the Swedish wolf, you suggest persons who recently published an article about the disastrous effects of hunting the current Swedish wolves and the need for more than thousands of wolves to fulfil the requirements of the directive and who blocked Naturvårdsverket from declaring the conservation state of wolf in June. That's a well-known method to control an issue: selection of persons with foreseeable opinions.

Your way of dealing with the Swedish environmental minister seems not as respectful as many Swedes would like.

The Governmental proposition on carnivores was presented to the Parliament. Within hours the Chairman of "Naturskyddsföreningen" informs the EU commissioner about the assumed intention of the Government to shoot more than 200 Swedish wolves this winter. He knows that he has good contacts with you, and that this has helped in stopping wolf hunt before. A Day later the spokesperson of the Commission (Joe Hennon) appears in Swedish Media indicating that EU will look very seriously into the matter. A coming decision of the Swedish Parliament that the wolf has favourable conservation state will be scrutinized for possibility of an offense against the EU-directive! Instead, EU could have expressed its satisfaction that Sweden finally is coming to a decision about the favourable conservation status. It is *very* displeasing that publically declared mistrust on this level appears year after year.

The EU spokesperson and commissioner repeat often their neutrality and their duty to control obedience to the EU law. When it is found necessary to repeat so often and emphatically, the trustworthiness is lost and raises suspicion.

Several times you have demanded changes of Governmental decisions already made. You seem to assume that it is an easy procedure for a Government to change decisions about what will happen within some weeks or to withdraw a delegation once made. This type of "Ministerstyre" does not fit into what is regarded as constitutional within Sweden. In the same way you do not seem to realise the limit of control over e.g. authorities Swedish ministers have.

If several circumstances like these accumulate, suspicions rise among those who think that Sweden got more wolves than needed. To them it seems that you are not objective but like to promote many wolves. That contributes to long time problems with acceptance. The first

paragraph in the EU-directive seems to be about “acceptance” and “social”. Are you really considering this in an appropriate way?

Wolf matter goes much beyond legalities

To reduce the attention and polarization of wolves, the most important outcome should be that a trustworthy long-term policy is launched, not that the outcome is legally perfect or liked by all fractions. Wolf numbers increase fast beyond what the Government, the majority of Parliament and many wolf-scientists officially consider FRP, while the EU blocks growth reduction by highly detailed views on different aspects of the process. A three year management delay by prolonged EU interaction is a disproportionate response to a culling initiated before the paper work was done. This all when, according to the proposition, the wolf had - or was very close to - favourable conservation state.

Final remarks

There are widely different opinions of varying quality and purpose. This is natural and unavoidable. Your expectations of a “real ownership” of the project shared by almost all in absence of comments of “controversial nature of implementations” are unrealistic. Much of the critic is certainly justified. Swedish institutions, including Government and “Naturvårdsverket”, do not manage the matter perfectly. In my opinion it would have been easy to fulfil many of your demands a year ago and I offer no explanation why more has not been done. Wolf *is* an extremely difficult and touchy problem and there exists no solution everyone is happy with, not even all experts and scientists. When dealing with wolf, “other” factors often overrule the sound judgement. Because of this it is important to make and implement decisions instead of delaying by arguing for better decisions, which probably never will come but are always cause for further delays. Too much time and effort has already been devoted to the decision procedure and different investigations and collection of opinions. The attention from the EU is the major reason why the process has been slow and ineffective.

Most probably I will edit this letter including adding relevant links. I may detect or other may focus my attention on mistakes or needed updates. Later editions with links will be available within a month, if asked for on email.

I wrote a somewhat kinder letter (dated 2012-04-17) suggesting that you brought the process to an end following discussions on the issue with Minister Lena Ek. I also suggested: less worries about current inbreeding; realizing that wolves become healthier by genetic selection performed using selective hunting and that immigration will get a larger effect if wolf numbers are lower... I expressed worries including inbreeding in the prerequisites for favourable conservation status, because this could mean that positive status would not occur in decades, and be a good argument against selective wolf hunt in the future. (I think that these ideas will become better implemented in Sweden since I wrote the previous

letter). I got no reply, so this time I write a more open and less polite letter and try to spread this to others, in the hope that the problems with your involvement will get wider attention.

I write as private person, so I hope this letter will not deepen your conflict with the Nation Sweden. My honest purpose is to make your more agreeable to put an end to this conflict. Fred Burger (NZ) has helped with English formulations.

Signature: Umeå 2013-09-19 Dag Lindgren, Professor emeritus – Forest Genetics,
contact: Dag.Lindgren@gronstenen.se