

AFRICAN



INDABA

Volume 3, Issue No 4

e-Newsletter

July 2005

Dedicated to the People and Wildlife of Africa

1 Hunting in South Africa: Facts, Risks, Opportunities

Part One

By Gerhard R Damm

South Africa is arguably the most sought after destination for traveling trophy hunters. And rightfully so, since the country offers so much to the visitor: a great variety of diverse habitats and landscapes on the southern tip of Africa; a selection of trophy animals which is second to none in the world; a highly developed professional hunting and game ranching industry as service providers; an excellent infrastructure; a wealth of other activities to complement hunting and last not least the cultural richness and hospitality of the Rainbow Nation. Hunting in South Africa is a great experience for any visiting hunter, novice or seasoned old-hand.

Hunting in South Africa is big business and contributes significantly to the national economy. However, the available statistical information lacks accuracy and depth. I therefore went through the Sisypus task to collect and analyze data from over 200 South African hunting websites. View the result in the table on pages 17/18. I have also analyzed information from papers of different authors and brought it into context with personal experience and communication with stakeholders.

Trophy hunting is a specialized form of tourism through sustainable wildlife utilization. It is the practical application of "Incentive Based Conservation". The World Conservation Union (IUCN) – gathered at the 3rd World Conservation Congress in Bangkok in November 2004 – has adopted the recommendation on sustainable consumptive use of wildlife and recreational hunting in Southern Africa proposed by the Game Rangers Association of Africa, the Endangered Wildlife Trust and the South African National Parks. With this Recommendation, IUCN "accepts that well-managed recreational hunting has a role in the managed sustainable consumptive use of wildlife populations".

DEAT Minister van Schalkwyk has recently appointed a panel of experts to develop norms and standards for the regulation of hunting at a national level to ensure a sustainable hunting industry in South Africa. DEAT obviously perceived the existence of a broader problem regarding the lack of an overall framework for regulating the hunting industry at a national level. In a media release after the appointment of the panel DEAT stated that "there is a general lack of consistent scientific information regarding the scale and nature of the industry, and poor monitoring of the

practices ... The hunting industry ... is regulated according to provincial ordinances which are in many cases outdated and not in line with current international best practices. It seems as if the central overarching problem with hunting in South Africa is that there is no coherent and comprehensive oversight of the hunting industry and a lack of clear national norms and standards for sustainable hunting ... Issues that need to be addressed in such a framework include a definition of sustainable hunting, regulatory measures and the delegation of permitting arrangements, joint management and scientific monitoring arrangements agreed to between government, national and provincial park authorities and private land owners, and monitoring of the allocation of any revenues generated through such hunting towards conservation."

This initiative of DEAT presents a great opportunity for the wildlife industry. In this article and its second part in the next African Indaba I will therefore discuss some significant developments and key figures, problems, opportunities and risks which impact on the country's hunting and conservation policies.

Hunting, and in a broader sense the killing of any living being, is ethically objectionable for some sections of society. Other parts of society see nothing wrong with hunting as long as it is conducted *ethically* within the parameters of *Fair Chase*. The word "ethics" has been grossly misused – especially by anti-hunting organizations – and is therefore misunderstood. Ethics is defined in the Oxford Dictionary as "The Science of Morals". A debate about "ethics" between people who have conflicting moral values, e.g. hunters and anti-hunters, will not produce any results. Therefore public debates about the morality of trophy hunting do not

Continued on Page 2

INSIDE THIS ISSUE

1. **Hunting in South Africa: Facts, Risks, Opportunities**
2. **Thoughts on Certification**
3. **Hunting in Namibia 2004: A Summary**
4. **Lessons From Zimbabwe**
5. **Hunting, Sustainability, and Property Rights in East and Southern Africa**
6. **Tanzania: Reduce the Quotas or Reform?**
7. **Tanzania: Hunting Concession Allocated to Abu Dhabis**
8. **The Professional Hunting Industry in South Africa: History and Future**
9. **A Strategy To Secure The Right To Hunt**
10. **Tanzania: Game Scouts Shoot Hundredpounder**
11. **African Indaba Congratulates Brian Nicholson**

African Indaba is a e-newsletter for hunter-conservationists and all people who are interested in the conservation, management and the sustainable use of Africa's wild natural resources

Continued from Page 1

1 Hunting in South Africa: Facts, Risks, Opportunities

serve any practical purpose. The discussion must rather be steered towards an acceptable regulatory framework and appropriate self-control mechanisms within the wildlife industry to create hunting standards and "conservation-effectiveness" of wildlife management.

1. An Overview of Hunting in South Africa

Over 60 species are available for hunting in South Africa. This certainly is the highest number worldwide – and coupled with the fact that all of the Big Five (even the Classic Big Five, with the recent inclusion of the Black Rhinoceros) can be hunted, it makes South Africa the top hunting destination in Africa. Many superb trophies are harvested every year by local and visiting hunters.

There are also negative sides to hunting in South Africa:

Wild lion hunting is very limited. I venture to say that a maximum of 10 truly wild male lion can be harvested per year. Nevertheless, a good number of those web pages evaluated offer lion "hunts" for male and/or female lion, usually with the addendum "price on request". These lion "hunts" are in most cases "canned shooting operations". You can read what Stewart Dorrington, president of PHASA, has to say about canned shooting on pages 12/13. As a visiting hunter, desiring to hunt lion, it is essential to do one's home work and obtain full details before the hunt in order to be sure that no "canned shooting" is involved. The canned shooting operators and those "hunters" who kill lion with them deserve contempt and rejection. All decent hunters in South Africa are looking forward to the day, when these nefarious practices are finally outlawed. As a footnote, I would like the reader to know that a TRAFFIC paper (2001) put the number of hunted lion for 1999 at 95 – it's your guess how many of those were wild!

There are also a number of "put & take" operations which release trophy animals (sometimes with guaranteed trophy size!) just prior to the hunter's arrival and others which "hunt released trophy animals" on ridiculously small properties. Other operators offer freak color variations, hybrids like crosses between black and blue wildebeest, kudu and eland, Bontebok which are genetically contaminated with Blesbok, etc. Last not least some even offer a variety of exotic game – we have heard of Russian boar, American bison, Asian water buffalo, Himalayan thar, etc.. Neither "put & take" operators, nor "purveyors" of freak and exotic game contribute in any way towards any conservation objectives; as a matter of fact they contravene the South African Biodiversity Act. Visiting hunters should shun them and the South African authorities should urgently deal with this issue.

Hunting in South Africa is subject to "free market principles". Therefore, trophy fees vary greatly between operators – and one of the most glaring examples in my research was the caracal which has a price tag of \$1500 with the most expensive operator and the "cheapest" operator paying a premium of \$30 to any hunter who kills a caracal during the safari (he doesn't say, however, if you have a chance to see, let alone shoot at one). Trophy fees for many other animals vary by 100% or much more between highest and lowest offer.

This makes it important that the visiting hunter does some in-

depth research before booking a safari. Many factors have to be considered apart from the trophy fee. The size and location of the properties hunted is of extreme importance. Does the property lie within the natural distribution range of the species? Does it hold a self sustaining number of huntable species and trophy size individuals within ecologically intact habitats? It is essential to remember that within the same area particularly well suited habitats can support specific species and/or higher densities of game whereas less suitable types may have lower game densities and species may be absent due to a combination of limiting factors.

Of importance is also whether the property is hunted exclusively by one safari operator and/or by the owner, or whether the hunting rights are sold to a number of itinerant operators. Somebody with a permanent or long term interest in hunting a certain area will usually manage game and trophy quality better.

The cheapest trophy fee is not really cheap, if there are no or few mature animals to hunt! A safari is like any other consumable commodity – you usually get what you pay for! I suggest therefore that hunters who contemplate a safari in South Africa should not look or negotiate for the lowest price; not even for a price which seems to hit the average or median of those evaluated – they should rather use the statistics as a guideline to put the complete safari experience into their individual perspective for the right and adequately priced hunting adventure.

The following definition, taken from the Fair Chase Definition of the former SCI African Chapter, could serve as a good baseline in one's selection criteria: *"Fair chase is defined as pursuit of a free ranging animal or enclosed ranging animal possessed of the natural behavioral inclination to escape from the hunter and be fully free to do so. A sport hunted animal should exist as a naturally interacting individual of a wild sustainable population, located in an area that meets both the spatial (territory and home range) and temporal (food, breeding and basic needs) requirements of the population of which that individual is a member."*

2. Economic Importance of Hunting in the South African Economy

The South African Provinces publish yearly figures for tourist hunting for the period 1 November to 30 September. Why this period has been chosen is unknown, and I suggest that a calendar year period would be more appropriate. Nevertheless, according to the latest provincial statistics 6,673 foreign hunters have visited South Africa during the reporting period in 2003/2004, and these hunters harvested 53,885 game animals whilst on safari of an average length of 11 days. Without any multiplier effects and using solely the figures provided by the provinces, the total economic value for tourist hunting stands at \$68.3 million.

I have not received a detailed breakdown by species of game animals hunted for the reporting period, but TRAFFIC has published the 1999 statistics with these details (C Patterson, 2001). Extrapolating from these figures, about 20 species (mainly ungulates) make up for the bulk of the hunted animals. Kudu and gemsbok stand on top of the list.

I have my doubts, however, regarding the correctness of the latest provincial data, since according to them the Eastern Cape

Continued on Page 14

2 Thoughts On Certification

By Ian Parker

The idea of certification turns me cold: it means more red tape. Many years ago an Indian friend said to me, "what is it about paper that so attracts you white people? How do you think that a piece of paper can make laws work? Let me tell you: the more paper you demand, the easier the laws are to get round. Take ivory: I have two tones, but instead of putting 2,000 kg on one permit, I put 200 kg on ten permits. And when you ask me about one lot, I immediately ask if you mean one or several of the other lots and you are confused." He was right and went on to talk about immigration and how the names Shah and Patel and how visas and permits can be endlessly confused.

I have written elsewhere about the old Kenya Game Department and the laws that demanded every wild animal trophy needed a permit, and how a single zebra hide on one permit could spawn 100 permits – each for a watch-strap made from it. By the end of the 1950s the Game Department was being called upon to issue between 65,000 and 75,000 permits to possess annually. Work it out: each permit took five minutes to write. Multiply 70,000 by 5 = 350,000 minutes = 5,833 hours = 729 man-days. That worked out at three men doing nothing but writing these permits for a year. This so overloaded the Department that it issued permit books to the trophy dealers so that they could issue the permits to customers. By the mid-1970s, when the trophy industry had gone through the roof, some dealers, the people the permits were supposed to control, were taking 100 books at a time. The same problem applies to CITES with over 50,000 species listed on its appendices. What manpower have to be dedicated to writing permits if CITES was to truly work? Or think of the other side of that coin. Without that manpower (which does not exist) can CITES ever work?

My question: does a permit or a certificate – a piece of paper – really stop hunters misbehaving? For nearly a hundred years the ivory trade was supposed to be controlled by permits. Compared to hiding and moving illegal, bulky, difficult-to-conceal tusks, buying a permit was a doddle. And so most illicit ivory acquired a permit and left Africa openly and 'legal'. Given the money involved in recreational hunting, I have little doubt that acquiring certification: getting that piece of paper, will be as prone to 'bending' as any other permit has ever been. What is this knee-jerk, white man's reflex – when faced with a problem demand a permit?

There is another aspect of the suggestions about certification that disturbs me. It is that the proposals will involve certification, not so much by African States, as nations elsewhere. The German CITES authorities, CIC, IUCN *et al*, but no African State get mentioned in the Indaba articles, and once again it is *uitlanders* calling the shots. This is unpopular in Kenya where there is a growing resentment of the degree to which westerners are telling Africa how to live and behave – not just in wildlife matters, though this is where it is an extreme feature – but in many other walks of life too. While I believe that Africa has brought much of this upon itself, what with corruption etc., I sympathize with the sentiment.

Before we take this dialogue much further, can we have some

data on hunting elsewhere? Is canned hunting unique to South Africa? Are there many 'tupa nyuma' hunters in the USA? How does Germany handle 'unethical' hunting? What is the average age of hunters in the countries where it is a widely practiced land use? I go back to a point in my article on tupa nyuma hunting. Many hunters who used to make safaris to East Africa were elderly and beyond the physical exertion of hunting on foot. Hunting big dangerous animals on foot has similarities to the physical needs of mountaineering: old *bokkies* don't go well up cliffs or swing easily from ropes. In turn, I suggest that this was because African safaris are expensive and, as a generalization, out of younger peoples reach.

Then there is another angle. The safari industry was expensive because, at least in Kenya – which is where it all started – it was managed by a cartel of professionals. In 1913 the Game Warden of the British East Africa Protectorate announced that he wanted to set up a professional Guides Association. His goal was a law-abiding, ethical safari industry, whose members would help the miniscule Game Department enforce the laws. If a professional misbehaved, he was out and lost his livelihood (and certification is merely re-inventing this old wheel). Overseas had to hire one of the registered few and could not hunt without one. The unforeseen consequence was no inexpensive hunting in East Africa for visitors because the professionals set the prices.

Until the late 1960s, most of East Africa was state or communal land and the Game Departments controlled who could hunt on it. There was little tourism hunting on private land. Further, the professionals invested in their guns, their tentage and their vehicles, but nothing in wild animals or their management. This, be it noted, is not a criticism but a simple statement of how things were. The rapid conversion of communal and public land to private tenure in Kenya upset the hunters as, to continue, they had to start making deals with the land owners who, quite naturally, wanted the lion's (canned or otherwise!) share from animals on their properties. In Southern Africa, there is a much closer tie between landowners and profitability from hunting. Elsewhere, the persistence of concessions on communal and state lands, in which investment in land and the resources is not of the same order as it is where land is owned privately, still perpetuates a basically inequitable situation. Many 'community based projects' reflect little real change in old ways.

And there is a lacuna in the present dialogue: where is the African professional? Early, after independence, the Kenya hunting industry came under strong pressure to Africanize with the same goal as the BEE Act in South Africa. The industry tried quite hard, but with little success between 1963 and 1977 when hunting was stopped. I believe that, in large part, this came about through misconceptions by all concerned. The State could force companies to employ African professionals, but it could never force the clientele to book them. One cannot order friendship and the degree to which white 'hunters' in Africa are more personal entertainers and friends than they are true hunters is not widely appreciated. Yet the strong link between professionals and their clients in which men of modest means and skills have access to the cap-

Continued on Page 6

3 Hunting in Namibia 2004: A Summary

By Gerhard R Damm

5 363 international hunters visited Namibia according to the statistics published by the Ministry of Environment & Tourism (MET) during the 2004 trophy hunting season, from 1st February to 30th November. They hunted a variety of species (see box on this page) and harvested a total of 22462 animals – 18.7% up from the figures of 2003 (18916 animals). The trends reported in the MET statistics are based on summarized data from the annual returns as submitted by the registered hunting professionals.

There are a total of 505 registered hunting professionals in Namibia. This country distinguishes between three categories: guides (131), master guides (211) and professional hunters (163). Hunting guides may only conduct hunts on their own farm(s), duly registered as a hunting farm(s); master hunting guides may only conduct hunts on their own farm(s) duly registered, plus two additional duly registered hunting farms. Professional hunters (PH) may conduct hunts on all farms, provided they have written permission from the owner of the property independent of whether the farm is registered or not. Only professional hunters with a big game license may conduct hunts with guests for elephant, rhinoceros, buffalo and lion. All hunting professionals must be in possession of a valid bow hunting license to guide bow hunters. Hunting by visiting tourists must be conducted exclusively in company of a registered hunting guide, master hunting guide or professional hunter.

The hunting professional must obtain a valid hunting permit (trophy hunting permit) from Nature Conservation prior to the start of the hunt. For cheetah and leopard an additional hunting permit has to be issued prior to the start of the hunt. A hunting guest may only take two animals of a kind each year, irrespective if the trophies are exported or not. All trophies must attain the minimum points of trophy quality. Exceptions are allowed only with old, set-back or very abnormal trophies (details of minimum requirements see <http://www.natron.net/napha/english/huntinglaws.html>).

The Namibian Professional Hunters' Association (NAPHA <http://www.natron.net/napha/>) is the national organization which represents professional hunting in the country; NAPHA works closely together with the Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET) to resolve issues regarding hunting legislation and the auctioning of the new Government concessions. Joof Lamprecht, spokesperson for NAPHA described tourist hunting in Namibia as a form of consumptive tourism with very low impact and very high return. He further stated in an interview with the Namibian in June that "the historical distribution of game, their sub-species and individual adaptations, habitat requirements and roles in ecosystems must be taken into account at all times,"

Lamprecht also said that "the revenue generated from the over 5 000 hunters hunting in Namibia annually, when compared

Species: English Name	Species: Scientific Name	1994	2003	2004
African Wild Cat	<i>Felis silvestris</i>	0	11	16
Baboon	<i>Papio ursinus</i>	13	106	130
Blesbok, Common	<i>Damaliscus pyragus phillipsi</i>	327	711	905
Buffalo, Cape	<i>Syncerus c. caffer</i>	3	25	20
Caracal	<i>Profelis caracal</i>	2	15	17
Cheetah	<i>Acinonyx jubatus</i>	20	86	81
Crocodile	<i>Crocodylus niloticus</i>	1	3	5
Dik-Dik, Damara	<i>Madoqua kirki damarensis</i>	3	56	91
Duiker, Grey	<i>Sylvicapra grimmia</i>	80	282	228
Eland	<i>Tragelaphus o.oryx</i>	113	581	643
Elephant	<i>Loxodonta africana</i>	22	61	36
Giraffe	<i>Giraffa Camelopardalis</i>	4	45	119
Hartebeest, Cape	<i>Alcelaphus b. caama</i>	739	1717	1999
Hippopotamus	<i>Hippopotamus amphibius</i>	0	6	5
Hyaena, Brown	<i>Hyaena brunnea</i>	2	3	2
Hyaena, Spotted	<i>Crocuta crocuta</i>	5	15	14
Impala, Black-Faced	<i>Aepyceros m. petersi</i>	17	26	45
Impala, Southern	<i>Aepyceros m. melampus</i>	107	485	560
Jackal, Black-Backed	<i>Canis mesomelas</i>	36	140	176
Klipspringer	<i>Oreotragus oreotragus</i>	8	62	68
Kudu, Greater	<i>Tragelaphus s. strepsiceros</i>	986	2719	3027
Lechwe	<i>Kobus l. leche</i>	0	8	4
Leopard	<i>Panthera pardus</i>	19	98	111
Lion	<i>Panthera leo</i>	1	12	9
Nyala	<i>Tragelaphus angasi</i>	0	9	6
Oryx	<i>Oryx gazella gazella</i>	1304	3290	3966
Ostrich	<i>Struthio camelus</i>	5	69	102
Reedbuck, Common	<i>Redunca a. arundinum</i>	0	2	2
Rhino, White	<i>Ceratotherium s. simum</i>	1	1	2
Roan, Southern	<i>Hippotragus e. equinus</i>	5	20	18
Sable	<i>Hippotragus niger niger</i>	1	37	30
Springbok, Black	<i>Antidorcas m. marsupialis</i>	0	8	0
Springbok, Common	<i>Antidorcas marsupialis hofmeyeri</i>	691	2279	2842
Steenbok	<i>Raphicerus campestris</i>	226	799	964
Tsessebe	<i>Damaliscus l. lunatus</i>	5	7	3
Warthog	<i>Phacochoerus africanus</i>	1113	2832	3087
Waterbuck, Common	<i>Kobus e. ellipsiprymnus</i>	12	124	194
Wildebeest, Black	<i>Connochaetes gnou</i>	110	454	619
Wildebeest, Blue	<i>Connochaetes t. taurinus</i>	125	692	886
Zebra, Burchell's	<i>Equus burchelli</i>	51	334	433
Zebra, Hartmann's	<i>Equus zebra hartmannae</i>	208	686	997
Totals	41 Species	6365	18916	22462

Source: P.Erb, Chief Conservation Scientist, Permit Office, Ministry of Environment & Tourism April 2005

Continued on Page 5

Continued from Page 4

3 Hunting in Namibia 2004: A Summary

to the 750 000 tourists in total, is a substantial one and there is a higher expenditure per person in the hunting market compared to the normal tourist*.

Although the statistics of MET did not indicate any values, and Lamprecht also did not mention values, I have endeavored to estimate the total direct monetary impact. According to my calculations the value (trophy fees) of the game harvested is about US\$12 million (excluding venison value). The hunters stayed most likely approximately 10 days on average at an estimated daily rate of US\$250, which adds US\$14 million (inclusive of tips) and their companion/observers are estimated to have spent approx US\$2.5 million in daily fees. The direct expenditure of 5363 trophy hunters in Namibia in 2004 therefore is about US\$28.5 million (equals N\$/ZAR 185.3 @ 6.5 exchange rate). Relating this to the total number of tourists, I estimate that the hunters (who represent less than 0.7% of the total tourist numbers) account for more than 4% of the total direct expenditure. Each tourist hunter in Namibia spends at least 5 times as many direct dollars or euros than his photographing counterpart and leaves a smaller ecological footprint! This estimate is made on very conservative assumptions.

In 2004 the 5363 visiting hunters (1994: 1918 hunters) came in their grand majority from Western Europe (3564 = 66.5%). Germany's hunters are represented with 1852 (=34.5%) and are the largest group. Hunters from the United States of America are quickly catching up, however. In 2004, 1123 American hunters (=20.9%) visited Namibia – very significantly up from just 73 Americans who hunted in Namibia in 1994. This acceptance of Namibia as a first class hunting destination by hunters from the United States is indeed significant for the hunting professionals in Namibia, especially when looking at the trend over the past five years or so. Whereas the total number of German hunters declined from the peak in 2001 (2213 German hunters) and only stabilized in 2004, American hunters seem to have discovered the new hunting Eden in Namibia. Their numbers almost doubled from 590 (2001) to reach 1123 (2004). The most significant growth rate was from 2003 to 2004 with almost 30%. Some of the background information I have gathered from a number of hunter internet forums points towards a preference of Namibia over South Africa by a growing number of American hunters. This preference has however little to do with the quality of the experience or the safari – but is rather to be traced back to the new gun import regulations of South Africa and the growing frustration of visiting hunters with an ever increasing trail of red tape.

The positive growth from the American market is expected to continue unabatedly with the growing experience of Namibian hunting professionals with American clients and continued expansion of the Namibian marketing efforts at the major hunting conventions in the United States.

The NAPHA office is located at 318 Sam Nujoma Drive, Klein Windhoek. If you need assistance or information, please contact Almut Kronsbein or Armgard Rechholtz at phone + 264(61) 234455 or email napha@mweb.com.na

4 Lessons From Zimbabwe

By Dr. Terry Cacek

During the 1980s and 90s, I traveled repeatedly from America to Zimbabwe and savored some of the finest hunting in Africa. I pursued antelope on the ranches, I did self-guided big game hunts in the Zambezi Valley, and I hunted elephants with professional hunters. Along the way, I spent two years working for the Parks and Wildlife Department in Botswana where I did dozens of self-guided hunts. I hunted in Cameroon, South Africa, Australia and North America. Of all these awesome experiences, my richest memories are from Zimbabwe. I love the country and the game. I love the white Zimbabweans and the Shona, Ndebele and Tonka. Now, the political and economic situations in Zimbabwe have gone sour. How very sad that the game ranches and most of the whites are gone. The safari companies are crippled and the Shona, Ndebele, Tonka and other black people of Zimbabwe are suffering terribly.

The former Rhodesian masters and Zimbabweans who succeeded them took great pride in their success in managing wildlife. They set up a system that was biologically and economically sustainable. In hindsight, we can see that it lacked some characteristics essential for social sustainability, and therefore was not politically sustainable in Zimbabwe. When it became politically expedient for the politicians in power to remove the white farmers and ranchers, they were whisked away. The destruction of the white-owned farms and ranches was not motivated primarily by racial issues, but by the perceived need to maintain political power. But surely if the farms and ranches had been owned by the majority Shona, and if the majority of the laborers had been Shona, it would not have been politically expedient for the government to sweep them aside. It was white ownership that made the farms and ranches such easy targets.

Now, every government in Africa is controlled by blacks and several countries have attempted to Africanize their hunting industries. They recognized the need to give black citizens a greater share of the wealth generated by hunting. These attempts resulted in disruption and failure, so the governments backed off and allowed reemergence of the white-owned companies. There may be several reasons why governments were quick to restore their hunting industries. Maybe they recognized the employment offered in rural areas. Certainly they needed the large sums of foreign currency generated. Perhaps they realized that a vibrant hunting industry provided the incentives, funds and mechanisms for sustainable use of wildlife. Nevertheless, their initial attempts to Africanize the industries suggest an intolerance of white ownership. In every nation, the threat exists that political forces may one day converge, as they did in Zimbabwe, and it may become politically expedient to end white domination of the wildlife industries.

The strategy of the Rhodesians and white Zimbabweans was to dig in their heels, and that clearly failed. The Zambian strategy was to require black ownership of safari companies, and that

Continued on Page 6

Continued from Page
4 Lessons From Zimbabwe

failed. In many cases, the white safari company owners simply recruited black lackeys who had little to contribute. They often had no experience in the industry, little concern for wildlife, and little thought of sharing wealth with local communities. By this means, the safari companies circumvented the regulations and stumbled along for a year or two until the regulations were changed.

There is another strategy that I believe could prove successful. Safari companies and white professional hunters (PHs) need to identify trackers and other blacks who exhibit high potential – not people who are a little above average but the top one half of one percent. These men and women need to be trained as hunters, organizers and entertainers. They need to become PHs. Then they need to be trained as managers and marketers so they can become directors of operations of safari companies. Then they need to be trained as executives so they can become partners in Safari companies. Past attempts to Africanize the safari industry have failed because legislation tried to force immediate involvement at the top. A successful strategy must begin with talented individuals who can work their way from the ground up. What could not be accomplished from the top down in one year can be accomplished with a bottom up approach. It will take a commitment of many years by governments, hunting organizations and safari companies.

I'm not suggesting that the safari industry must be black dominated. Some clients will want to hunt with white PHs and some will want to hunt with black PHs. Yes, it's true some American clients, especially those who have done several safaris, would prefer a black PH. The industry should accommodate both preferences.

I believe this can work because I have seen it work. When I was researching my book, *Professional Hunters For A Changing Africa*, I hunted with two black PHs. Both took me to within five yards of elephants and brought me back alive. I would travel to the end of the earth with these guys, and if they told me to jump off, I would jump. Buy my book (please, I need the royalties) and read the stories of Dumisani Marandu and Joseph Chitambwe of Zimbabwe and Paulo P. Sha-Nalingigwa of Tanzania. These are village-born Africans who clawed their way up the ladder of success despite enormous hardships, including resistance from old-school white hunters. I also interviewed five other successful black PHs, two black managers of quasi-governmental safari companies, and a black owner of a private safari company.

To my knowledge, there are black PHs in Zimbabwe, Zambia, Tanzania, Botswana, Cameroon, and probably other countries. Namibia and South Africa have training programs designed to elevate blacks in the hunting industry, but these programs still lack widespread support from the professional hunting industry and from international hunters' organizations. Safari Club International (SCI) has made a token donation to the Namibian program, but much more must be done and the Dallas and Houston Safari

Continued on Page 7

Continued from Page 3
2 Thoughts on Certification

tains of industry and the power-broking politicians across Europe and North America is historically only mirrored by medieval court jesters. These entertainers had unique access to the pinnacles of power. The African safari was, perhaps in the majority of cases, not a hunt as it would be in Europe or North America, but more a rather unique form of holiday and entertainment in which some hunting was done. Viewed in this light, the failure to integrate African hunters into the business was a failure to comprehend the cultural bond between the court jester and the King.

Perhaps this would not have happened if the cartel had never existed and hunters of modest means could have come to Africa and really roughed it, employing men who were normally gun bearers and trackers for the professionals. Hunting with no more comfort than the poachers have, without cool drinks, tents, baths, showers and bustling servants that have become such a feature of the 'court' routine, a cadre of professionals might well have evolved and, by developing reputations at this level, their best members might have climbed the income tree. I think *African Indaba* serves a useful purpose in stimulating dialogue on the subject of hunting because the field is characterized by many contradictions. Yet, if the hunting community wishes to truly abide by a controlling set of rules, to do away with canned hunting and shooting from cars, then surely a far more effective deterrent to breaking those rules would be say five years of the miscreant's life in an African slammer and the loss of livelihood proposed way back in 1913? There is no real substitute for effective law enforcement on the spot, in the field. Certificates ... bits of paper that is ... have never really worked in Africa in the past and I don't expect them to in the future.

African Indaba eNewsletter

Editor & Publisher: Gerhard R Damm
Postal Address: PO Box 411, Rivonia 2128, RSA,
Email: gerhard@muskwa.co.za
Web: www.africanindaba.co.za
P +27-(0)11-883-2299, Fax +27-(0)11-784-2074

Opinions expressed in African Indaba are not necessarily those of the publisher and editor. Whilst every care is taken in the preparation of this newsletter, we cannot accept any responsibility for errors.

African Indaba eNewsletter is published every two months as a free service to the sustainable use community. Please share it with others who may be interested in the topics covered by African Indaba. We welcome contributions and would like to remind you that archived copies of African Indaba eNewsletter are available from our website.

Requests for free subscription or article submissions should be sent to the Editor with full name, organization & address and e-mail address

African Indaba is a e-newsletter for hunter-conservationists and all people who are interested in the conservation, management and the sustainable use of Africa's wild natural resources

Continued from Page
4 Lessons From Zimbabwe

Clubs, the International Council for Game and Wildlife Conservation (CIC, from the French name), and Shikar need to lend their support.

The transition to greater black involvement must involve every segment of the safari industry. The whole industry is driven by clients, mostly American clients. Most clients have read Robert Ruark and Peter Capstick and many want to duplicate that special relationship between a client and a white PH. Thousands of others have done the PH worship and are ready for a richer African experience, and that can involve a black PH. Some experienced hunters prefer black PHs.

At the other end of the industry are the governments that regulate the safari companies. Governments must support training programs for blacks, such as the programs at Mushandike, Zimbabwe and Mweka, Tanzania, and the newer programs in Namibia and South Africa.

Governments must remove inappropriate barriers to entry into the hunting profession. For example, many blacks attended inferior schools and may not be good writers. They should be allowed to take PH examinations orally. My PH doesn't need to read Shakespeare; he needs to read tracks in the dust. What governments must *not* do is lower the standards for blacks. The oral exam given to underprivileged blacks should have the exact same questions, with the exact same minimum score, as that given to white candidates.

Many have called for a system of competitive tenders for the allocation of hunting concessions. However, startup black safari companies have less access to capital than established white companies. Therefore, I would support a system that favors tenders from black owned companies. It should still be competitive, and the favoritism should be spelled out in advance and should be totally transparent. The favoritism should be carefully designed so it does not jeopardize the quality of experience for clients.

In the last issue of African Indaba, several writers called for programs to certify nations and safari companies which meet certain standards of wildlife conservation and social welfare. Standards that might be feasible for well-financed, white-owned companies might be barriers to entry into the industry for startup black entrepreneurs. If one of the social welfare issues is black participation in the industry, then certification standards might be self-defeating. Black-owned companies might need technical or financial assistance to meet the standards.

White PHs and white-owned safari companies must play a major role. They must do most of the training and they must promote blacks. If they dawdle, progress should be made a condition of their PH licenses and concession contracts. Is a requirement to train your future competitors too bitter a pill to swallow? Not if it is essential to the overall health and sustainability of the safari industry. White PHs and safari companies must contemplate the lessons from Zimbabwe. They must take the long view. The very best PHs will accept this challenge and will prosper alongside their black brethren.

Having interviewed and hunted with a dozen blacks who are

moving up in the industry, I have a pretty good assessment of their capabilities. Their hunting skills ranged from excellent to superb. The organizational and communications skills ranged from adequate to superb. Most were deficient in marketing skills. I proposed to SCI that they bring every interested black PH to their annual convention in Nevada and provide a workshop on marketing. Maybe the time wasn't right, or maybe it is just too expensive to do this in America. Maybe we needed a coalition of international organizations that could have shared the cost, as the cost was too high for SCI to carry by itself. There is a need to provide assistance to blacks with the challenge of marketing at the international scale and this assistance may need to occur in Africa, Europe and America.

Of all the parties that must contribute to the racial diversification of the safari industry, the greatest burden will be borne by blacks themselves. Given half a chance, they will do just fine. They bring to the industry a knowledge of wildlife engrained in their culture over the centuries and they know better than any of us how to bring the benefits of wildlife to their people.

I am not calling for an industry that is dominated by blacks, but rather for an industry that ultimately will be color blind. I want to see an industry that has enough black participants that it could not be abolished without political repercussions. Highly visible participation by blacks would enable a more constructive dialogue between the industry and the black governments and also between the industry and rural communities. Above all, I want to see a safari industry that draws from all available talent, develops all employees to their fullest potential, and provides clients with the richest possible African experiences.

NEW BOOK: AGRED's South African Gamebirds

Field Identification and Management

This book by Dr Slang Viljoen and superbly illustrated by Penny Meakin features 63 species of gamebirds, aquatic and terrestrial, also those no longer hunted. Useful features are identification keys and illustrations of individual feathers and eggs which assist in diagnosing difficult species and determining the presence of gamebirds in the veld. The chapters on gamebird management are the most authoritative summary yet published and of importance to the conservation-conscious landowner. This book by the **African Gamebird Research & Education Trust (AGRED)** is based on extensive research and contains a repository of unique information for hunters and landowners. It will serve as a tool to grow a still underdeveloped wing shooting industry. The book is available from October 2005 in a signed collector's edition (numbered 1-500) in half-bound goatskin and matching slipcase and a subscriber's edition. The closing date for having your name included in the subscribers' list is July 31st.

Available from AGRED, Email: agred@netdial.co.za, phone/fax +27-11-7828756, or order directly from the AGRED website at www.agred.com

5 Hunting, Sustainability, and Property Rights in East and Southern Africa

By Fred Nelson, Mike Jones, and Andrew Williams

The previous issue of *African Indaba* contained a call for discussion on the management of tourist hunting and its reform in Africa, and a range of articles in that issue began this discussion by raising important management issues and perspectives. We aim to contribute to this discussion and further it by exploring the fundamental issue of property rights in the sustainability of trophy hunting as a conservation tool and source of economic production in the East and Southern African region. We make the case that secure property rights for wildlife at the level of private or communal landholders is the single most important issue to hunting's sustainability, and runs like a red thread through all of the various reform issues raised in the previous *African Indaba*.

In *At the Hand of Man*, his widely read 1993 account of the practice and politics of African wildlife conservation, Raymond Bonner wrote that "there isn't a serious conservationist in Africa today" who does not believe in sustainable utilization of wildlife. While such declarations from successful journalists are undoubtedly gratifying to many hunters and conservationists in Africa, the polemics of the for-or-against debates over hunting- for example those occurring in Kenya today- obscure the core issues relating to hunting's value and sustainability. The key questions in a discussion of trophy hunting management and reform in modern Africa are as follows:

- ❖ First, under what conditions is hunting achieving its conservation and economic potential?
- ❖ Second, how can those conditions be promoted and spread to other areas where hunting is carried out in African countries?

Although commercial trophy hunting is practiced across much of east, central, and southern Africa, it is in the latter region that both wildlife populations and the hunting industry are strongest. Zimbabwe, Namibia, and South Africa share a set of common experiences that characterize both their approaches to wildlife management and the nature of their hunting industry. All 3 countries devolved property rights to wildlife on privately held land to those landowners in the 1960's and 1970's. The results of this experiment- a radical experiment indeed in the global context of natural resource management- was extraordinarily beneficial for the region's wildlife populations. Zimbabwe's wildlife recovered on private lands after the landowners gained management rights; wildlife on private farms and ranches in Zimbabwe reportedly quadrupled in the 1980's and 1990's. In Namibia wildlife on private lands underwent a similar recovery, increasing by over 90% from 1972 to 1992 on the private lands that cover about 40% of the country. In Zimbabwe, Namibia, and South Africa, the economic value that wildlife has been able to produce for private landholders has led to heavy investment in the wildlife sector; trophy hunting has been one of the main forms of investment and

a major reason why wildlife has become so valuable- and therefore widespread- on private lands in southern Africa.

Importantly, Zimbabwe and Namibia both attempted, after their respective dates of independence in 1980 and 1990, to transfer the success of devolved wildlife management on private lands to the communal lands where most of those countries' populations lived. Zimbabwe attempted to do this through its much-heralded CAMPFIRE program, which devolved responsibility for wildlife management to rural district councils. It is an important piece of history that the original concept design for CAMPFIRE sought to devolve control over wildlife straight to the landholder level, rather than to the districts, but there were no village level governance bodies that could function as 'landholders' below the districts. Nevertheless, CAMPFIRE is widely credited with spurring the recovery of wildlife populations in many rural parts of Zimbabwe during the past twenty years. Trophy hunting is the main economic activity in the CAMPFIRE districts, and, in confirmation of hunting's much-vaunted durability and economic resilience in the face of social upheaval, hunting enterprises have continued in these areas during the past five years of political turmoil in Zimbabwe.

In the early 1990's Namibia began developing its own legal and policy reforms to transfer rights over wildlife to communal lands. It learned from the Zimbabwean experience with CAMPFIRE that transferring rights to the district level was insufficient as an incentive for local communities to invest in wildlife, and that district control brought on a host of accountability problems in terms of the use of revenues. Namibia took the devolutionary process a step beyond CAMPFIRE in its 1996 wildlife act revisions which provide for the establishment of communal conservancies. In these conservancies, self-defined groups of people (the 'communities') living in traditional communal lands are able to obtain user rights to wildlife from the government and then market these rights to the private sector. As with the initial devolution of wildlife rights on private lands, these reforms on communal lands have led to a veritable explosion of investment in wildlife as a form of land use, with nearly 10% of Namibia's area being set aside as communal conservancies in the past eight years. Wildlife populations in communal areas like Kunene Region in Namibia have rebounded, including species like desert elephant and black rhino. And as with CAMPFIRE, the hunting industry has been a beneficiary of Namibia's devolutionary approach, with more wildlife and thus higher quality concessions available in communal lands, and with economic incentives for the communities to maintain their wildlife for hunting and other uses. Namibia's overall success in managing its wildlife through devolved rights and responsibilities on private and communal lands is surely a main reason that its recent CITES petitions to sell off stockpiled ivory and to re-introduce black rhino trophy hunting have been accepted internationally.

The landholder-based wildlife management policies in Namibia and Zimbabwe have been striking over the past 30 years in terms of their success in not only maintaining but expanding wildlife populations and habitats on private and communal lands. What is perhaps even more striking, however, is the degree to

Continued on Page 9

Continued from Page 8

5 Hunting, Sustainability & Property Rights in East and Southern Africa

which these approaches remain the exception rather than the rule in terms of wildlife management in the rest of Africa.

Several of the articles in the previous Indaba discussed wildlife management and trophy hunting issues in Tanzania (Baldus/Cauldwell, Simon Milledge, and Craig Packer), and this east African nation provides an instructive comparison to Namibia and Zimbabwe. As long ago as 1990, Tanzanian policy-makers and foreign donors began a process of re-evaluating and reforming the country's approach to wildlife conservation. This reform process was based on a few core issues. First, that the country had lost a significant proportion of its elephants, rhinos, and other large mammal species due to uncontrolled poaching in the 1970's and 1980's. It was widely acknowledged that the lack of local community involvement in wildlife management had played a major role in these wildlife declines. Wildlife was the property of the State wherever it occurred, and local communities had no economic incentives to look after the resource. The root problem in Tanzania's conservation history has always been this lack of local property rights in wildlife, and the result has been the gradual disappearance of wildlife populations from many rural areas.

The Tarangire ecosystem in Tanzania is a case in point; this system, with one of the largest migratory ungulate populations in eastern Africa, contains Lake Manyara and Tarangire National Parks but over 80% of the system lies on unprotected community lands. Although this wildlife creates much value through both tourism and trophy hunting, local people get little or no share and have no control over hunting conducted on their lands. The result is that much of the system's wildlife has been lost to poaching and land use changes during the past twenty years; oryx and hartebeest have disappeared from some areas and wildebeest may have declined by 80% according to recent surveys.

The policy reform movement that occurred in Tanzania in the 1990's was well aware of these problems, and their local causes, as well as the successful experiences with local management being produced in southern Africa. Tanzania's Wildlife Policy, released in 1998, consequently called for major reforms whereby local communities and private landholders would manage wildlife on their lands for their own benefit. User rights to wildlife would be localized, and wildlife would be able to 'pay its way' as a valuable form of land use.

The problem, as some of the articles in the previous issue alluded to, is that since the Wildlife Policy's release these changes in management have not happened. Wildlife remains the property of the state everywhere, and a move to create new community-managed 'Wildlife Management Areas' has made little headway. Communities remain excluded from managing and benefiting from the utilization of wildlife on their lands.

Although this status quo jeopardizes the future of Africa's largest national trophy hunting industry, the trophy hunting community has not been pro-active in contributing to reforms in Tanzania. The general sentiment among the hunting industry within the country is a reluctance to support local management of wildlife and any change to the existing strictly centralized system. This

may seem perverse given the successes of private and community conservation following devolutionary reforms in southern Africa, but most hunters in Tanzania appear to not have learned the lessons from Zimbabwe and Namibia or do not believe that they are applicable in Tanzania. However, one clear reason for reticence to change the existing system is that Tanzania's wildlife is badly under priced. The lack of competitive tendering or bidding for concessions results in formal prices for trophy animals and hunting blocks which are under their actual market value, and thus the existing system benefits established operators while reducing the value to the country of its wildlife.

A number of important practical issues for discussions of hunting reform emerge from this review of different countries' experiences. The first is that the single most important issue for hunting's sustainability in Africa is the degree to which property rights in wildlife, and control over the resource's benefits, is controlled by landholders. Without these local rights wildlife will increasingly be confined to parks and reserves and will disappear from rural landscapes on the basis of simple economics. It is essential to examine why efforts to devolve rights over wildlife to local communities are stalled in countries like Tanzania, or are in threat of being reversed as in Botswana, and to build collaborative groups of different interests to work towards the necessary reforms. The hunting industry widely calls for reforms to re-introduce hunting in Kenya as a way of making wildlife valuable to landholders in that country. These calls are justified, but the relative silence over equally important reform issues in countries like Tanzania weakens the legitimacy of the hunting fraternity's voice.

One mechanism for addressing these reform issues, which is increasingly employed in global conservation efforts and which Craig Packer proposes with respect to lion hunting, is that of independent certification. Certification could operate at the level of countries, or it could probe deeper to evaluate different company or concession operations within major hunting countries. At whatever level it operates, the key issues for certification of a hunting operation should include the availability of monitoring data, the transparency of the system of concession allocation, and the degree to which rural landholders are able to manage and benefit from hunting activities through secure wildlife rights.

We note that Packer's proposal for lion hunting certification does not include any mention of this last issue. This is a critical omission, as the future of lions, and lion hunting, is largely an economic one. Where lions are able to produce high returns to local landholders, which equal or exceed their high costs, they will have the best chance of surviving. Where locals continue to suffer costs that exceed the benefits of living with lions, no matter how effective hunting company monitoring and anti-poaching investments are, the lions are likely to disappear. The same economic equation holds for the prey species that the lions depend on. Few issues could be more urgent to the hunting industry in Africa than moving towards more viable lion conservation practices that start with giving local landholders rights to manage and benefit from these destructive but valuable animals.

Although many vested interests in governments and private

Continued on Page 14

6 Tanzania: Reduce the Quotas or Reform?

By Andrew Cauldwell

In a recent discussion, a professional hunter, referred to here as Fred, stressed that the Wildlife Department must reduce the hunting quota, particularly for lion and buffalo. Fred observed that hunters in blocks adjacent to his own were hunting too many lion and as a result were shooting young specimens that had not yet developed into good trophies. Research has shown this can be very detrimental to lion populations. Fred also observed a shortage of mature buffalo bulls. He attributes this trend to the fact that 80 buffalo having been killed as trophies legally last year in two neighbouring concessions. From Fred's perspective, reducing the quotas appears to be the easy solution to what he considers "over-harvesting", however there are other perspectives.

In Tanzania, the current wildlife management system puts the realizable financial income from trophy hunting by visiting hunters in direct dependency to the number and species hunted within a given concession area. The income which accrues to the Wildlife Division is NOT based on payment of the respective fees for the species/numbers allocated in the quota, but ONLY on the value of those reported as "hunted and killed" or "wounded and lost".

Like many departments of developing countries the Tanzania Wildlife Department experiences financial constraints. These constraints eventually lead to increasing the hunting quota of a concession to boost the revenue stream. Species with high trophy fees and/or of particular interest to the visiting hunter, like lion and buffalo are arguably most affected by this trend. Demanding reduced quotas will naturally meet resistance from different parties, albeit for equally different reasons.

Many hunting blocks have substantial (numerically high) buffalo populations, and overall there is no shortage of these animals. But in some areas serious problems exist. The company that last year hunted 80 buffaloes is notorious for subleasing the concession on geographical and/or time basis. It is a fact that many different operators and professional hunters were involved in the safaris conducted there. These subcontractors have at best only a transient interest in the quality of hunting in the concession, little if no interest in its management and no concerns regarding the future. Many of the subleasing companies are managed by business people whose interest is a short-term cash flow, maximized by increasing the number of hunts sold, rather than the quality of the offered hunting opportunities. This attitude has disastrous ecological consequences, creates a very disadvantageous picture for safari hunting and leads to client dissatisfaction.

Safari companies who act in the unsavoury game of sub-lessees and sub-lessors usually work on marginal concession in contrast to those well-established and well-known safari operators with hunting blocks in better areas with greater wildlife populations). Some of these companies boast of high-level influence in the Tanzania Government; some even have wider reaching connections and influence with members of foreign governments.

The payments of the safari operators to the Tanzania Wildlife Department are based on the number of animals hunted and the concession fee. Whilst the concession fee, irrespective of the

quality of the concession, is a fixed amount of US\$7,500 pa, the income from trophy fees varies according to the utilization of the quota (a minimum use of 40% in monetary terms has to be observed).

Companies with international exposure on the worldwide hunting market and with a history of successful safaris use advanced marketing strategies and their history of satisfied clients to aggressively market an exclusive product (safari) at a very high price (daily rate). They can afford to minimize the number of safaris and the off-take of trophy animals without compromising profitability; to the contrary they are maximizing economic return. Although this concept is ecologically sustainable in terms of quota utilization, it falls short from a socio-economic aspect, by reducing the potential income for the Wildlife Department. Due to the high-level influence of some safari operators in prime concession areas, the Department is unable to take corrective measures with them.

Budgetary restraints force the Department to try to recover the "lost income" of these prime concessions elsewhere. Companies that sublease their concessions and also companies who manage their less attractive areas responsibly and hunt ethically are converted into cash cows. Another means to maximize returns are splitting of blocks whilst substantially increasing the original quota.

The challenge is to find a solution to the very real problem of unsustainable utilization in some hunting areas and to the under-utilization of others. The Wildlife Department needs an adequate budget and the funds have to come from the assets the Department manages on behalf of all Tanzanians. The recent increase in trophy fees will improve the revenue stream. However this income is still directly linked to the animals hunted and therefore this step is only short term a stop-gap solution.

I argue that a reform of the entire hunting system is essential. The bulk of the hunting revenue accrued to the Department must be generated from the right to hunt. In other words the monies realized from hunting block leases must be commensurate with market values and this is determined by the quality of the concession, and last not least by the quality and numbers of the game available there. Good blocks should have a higher value than poor blocks. Adopting this simple measure will significantly increase the calculable revenue to the Department and would assist in reducing the administrative burden substantially. Another advantage would be that generally applicable trophy fees could be stabilized at a moderate level for a long period. At the same time the Department must look into the sub-leasing issue. The objective must be to recruit safari operators with a long-term interest in the sustainable ecological management of their concession areas. The lease period for concessions stands in direct relation to the interest of the safari operator in sustainable management. This is in other words "Incentive Based Conservation", where the responsible and ethically motivated safari operator combines his justified economic interest with his socio-economic responsibility, since he is willingly taking over certain conservation functions and costs.

Modalities need to be worked out to achieve this noble objective, and it might be a complex process. The safari hunting industry and the international hunting organizations should offer their intellectual and economic possibilities to achieve this reform, which ultimately will benefit the people of Tanzania, their wildlife and ensure the future of safari hunting in this country.

7 Tanzania: Hunting Concession Allocated to Abu Dhabis

By Sariah Kaaya

Credible information from reliable official and non-governmental organization sources in Tanzania said that a hunting concession will be allocated to the royal family of Abu Dhabi by the Tanzania Government. The hunting block lies in Yaida Ward, Mbulu District, near Lake Eyasi in Northern Tanzania. The 3 villages affected are Yaida Chini, Mongo wa Mono and Eshkesh. The area is mainly populated by Barabaig peasants and livestock-keepers and Hadza hunters and gatherers. The Hadza are the last bushmen of Tanzania and still depend on using wild natural resources in Yaida Ward. The Government has not confirmed that the block will be allocated. All 3 village governments endorsed the opening of hunting in their areas of jurisdiction. As can be expected in a situation where major financial benefits are promised, opinions in the villages and the administration are split on the issues and many political quarrels have started already. The Arusha based representatives of the Abu Dhabis had explored the hunting area end of March and seemed to be satisfied. According to local sources, however, wildlife populations consisting mainly of Thompson's gazelles, wildebeest, impala and some of the rarer antelopes are low and have been over-utilized in recent years through resident night hunting. The block has no migration which could fill the gaps. Cats are reported as rare and the few buffaloes stay mainly in the tsetse infested thickets and are difficult to hunt from cars, which is the preferred hunting method.

The sheiks are required to pay the normal hunting block fee of 7,500 US\$ per year plus the trophy fees for the quota used. They have promised to support the District, e.g. through a secondary school, paved roads and airstrip, motorcycles and employment and have already donated a Landrover to the District Game Officer of Mbulu.

The United Arab Emirates are known for major donations to Tanzanian institutions and individuals in recent years in relation to the hunting concession of Loliondo which they use since the early nineties. The Loliondo concession is owned by the Dubai royal family, but the Abu Dhabi are also allowed to hunt there. They are known to come in as groups of about 100 men at a time, of which many hunt. There are normally 2 Government game scouts present, but they are unable to keep an overview of what is happening due to many foreign hunters involved. The sheiks from Dubai have the reputation of hunting in a more controlled way in Loliondo than their neighboring relatives. Many allegations of overshooting quotas and unethical hunting have been raised in recent years by different NGOs. The Kenyan press even created the term "Loliondogate". The accusations could rarely be substantiated and have always been repudiated by the Tanzanian Government which entertains historically close relations to the Gulf States. Undoubtedly much money has been spent by the concession holders of the Loliondo block, but this was not in the form of transparent and well planned projects, but more on an ad hoc basis and often ending up with individuals.

Dubai pays the whole quota allocated in Loliondo irrespective of whether it is used or not (game fees are normally paid only, if

the animals are killed). The total trophy quota value of approx. US\$300,000 paid by the Arab concession holders of the Loliondo block therefore generates the highest revenue of all hunting blocks for the Government. This is all the more significant, since Loliondo does not have any elephants (the highest value trophy animal) on the quota. The value of the fully paid trophy quota (whether hunted or not) for Loliondo is put into an interesting perspective when compared to the trophy fees realized from some of the best elephant hunting blocks in Tanzania. An international well-known hunting and photographic safari operator who has hunted these prime blocks already for a very long time paid in 2003 approximately US\$50,000 in trophy fees **Editor's Note:** *The net realizable market value of prime concession areas is far from being achieved – see also other related articles).*

The management of hunting lies with the Wildlife Division of the central Government and decisions on the allocation of blocks are taken without any local participation and sometimes against the wishes of the villages affected. 25 % of hunting proceeds go to the Districts where this money is normally used for general administrative purposes and rarely reaches the villages concerned. Local NGOs demand therefore in the Yaida case transparency, written contracts about the promised benefits and arrangements, agreed natural resource and land use plans according to Tanzanian laws, a wildlife census and full participation of the communities. There are in particular human rights' worries, as the Hadza hunter-gatherers also use the hunting block as part of their traditional life style. The District Game Officer was quoted that there would be no conflict, but also that the Hadza living in the bush would have to move into villages during hunting season.

Hunting, an Added Value for Biodiversity

A New Publication by the Federation of Associations for Hunting and Conservation of the E.U. (FACE)

The degradation of wildlife habitats, due to intensive agriculture, ecosystem fragmentation, industrial pollution and mass tourism, has created reactions: *the necessity to safeguard the incredible natural heritage and, a greater expectation vis-à-vis the hunter, as manager of natural systems.* Hunting is a tool to manage wildlife and habitats. Hunters' actions integrate dimensions of duty and competence in global environmental issues. Hunting includes nature conservation by managing habitats and their species. FACE promotes hunting according to the principles of rational and sustainable use of natural resources, to conserve and manage wildlife, and protect, restore and create habitats. Conservationists and hunters share the same concerns with similar and reconcilable ultimate objectives and dialogue between them directly benefits wildlife and habitats. Hunters have initiated many actions in favor of wildlife and biodiversity in general. This publication presents some examples in a series of specific case studies.

Obtain your copy of this publication for €25 (production & shipping costs) by e-mailing: conservation@face-europe.org

8 The Professional Hunting Industry in South Africa: History and Future

By Stewart Dorrington (Speech at the Limpopo Wildlife Expo)

PHASA was established by some remarkable professional hunters, who saw the need of such an organization some 28 years ago. These old professional hunters were in it for the love ... the love of nature, the love of outdoors and the love of hunting. It was hard to make money in those days it was more of a life style. I think of names like Steve Smith, Basie Maartens, Coenraad Vermaak, Bertie Guillaume, and others, some still hunting today. We must always be grateful for what they started and the vision that they had. We must preserve the values that these folk established. Even 28 years ago, there were issues facing the then small industry. Some of these issues are being repeated again today! They were the "fly by nights" acting as operators and fleecing clients of deposits, substandard hunts began giving SA a bad reputation as a hunting destination. This is when the professional hunters got together and formed PHASA. They worked together with government to establish regulations governing the industry whilst at the same time establishing their own code of conduct and constitution for PHASA. The emphasis of this constitution has always been to keep the hunting industry clean and wholesome.

Little did the founding fathers know what the industry would grow to in SA. The poor economics of cattle ranching and the declining value of the rand, especially during the 90s, saw a massive growth in game ranching. This was driven by the demand for hunting, both local and trophy hunting. Having a game farm also became a very vogue thing for many business people and investors. The demand for rare and expensive game species took off. Big money entered the scene, from game farmers, local investors and also from hunting clients, who invested in South Africa.

SA became the biggest hunting destination in Africa drawing clients mostly from the USA and Europe. Professional hunting schools sprung up because Nature Conservation could not cope with the demand of testing all the aspiring PHs. Game farms sprung up everywhere and nearly every farmer or his son became a professional hunter! In addition, growth was further stimulated by the increase in foreign tourists to the new South Africa, which resulted in more farmers going into game with the intention of capitalizing on the tourist market. In doing this, they further increased the value of wildlife...especially the rare species.

There is no doubt that professional hunting has done well for wildlife conservation in SA. It is the dynamo that drives the game ranching industry. It has seen millions of hectares being reclaimed from domestic stock farming and put down to conservation. Not only have the species benefited, but entire stems and biodiversity in general. Oxspeckers and vultures are some of the indirect beneficiaries as well as many of the smaller game species. Even predators such as leopard have benefited from trophy hunting. A farmer will allow a leopard to consume some of his game or stock knowing that he may derive income if it is legally hunted. Without the potential to earn income, it will simply be destroyed as the cost

of keeping it is too high! The anti hunting lobby needs to understand this. Preservation on private property has little incentive unless there is some economic benefit. The increase in game farms has also provided the springboard to many other tourism ventures like lodges, hiking trails, 4x4 routes, etc. One could ask whether this would have happened if the game industry had not boomed, and could the game industry have boomed, if it were not for professional hunting? Certainly not! If the demand for hunting dies, so too will the high prices for game, and the incentives for farmers who are now in tourism diminish as a substantial portion of their income is derived from live game sales. Not all areas are conducive to tourism. They can however sustain considerable game populations instead of domestic stock if they are able to market hunting and live game. Should they be denied the chance to game farm?

The tremendous growth has not been without problems. Most of them are still with us and are growing. The adage "if it pays it stays" became well accepted, even if the species in question had little or no conservation value. In addition, many landowners had little idea of game farming, they had little idea of habitat requirements for different species and little idea for the need to preserve biodiversity, etc. Game that was in demand was sought, irrespective of other factors. Farmers had found an alternative to domestic stock, with attractive financial returns. In consequence species were moved to areas where they had never occurred before, different genetic groups were mixed and populations were manipulated purely to make money for the game farmer. Conservation was often forgotten. Economics became the main driving force.

The ethical standards of professional hunting were also compromised. Many new PHs and some older ones too have let economics supersede the principles of fair chase. Canned lion hunts and unacceptable put & take practices emerged. Some hunting safaris became shooting sprees, with no hunting involved. This has been driven by some trophy hunters demanding to improve on or to collect large trophy animals or multiple species within a very short safari. The SCI record book has helped to erode the principles of fair chase further as some clients don't seem to care how their trophy is obtained as long as it meets their requirements. For some, tight economics also compromised fair chase.

These developments have made the professional hunting industry vulnerable to anti hunters who are actively lobbying against hunting in all forms. The hunting industry also has not won the support of the black people. It has given them little benefit except those that are directly employed. But this is not the biggest potential threat to the industry: right now it is government policy. However this threat could be transformed into our biggest opportunity.

Since 1994 there has been a declining interest and ability of government and the provinces to control and service the industry. The prosecution of offenders and "hunting rogues" is a function of the provinces and it has not happened! The timely issuance of permits remains a problem. The transformation of the 4 old provinces into 9 new ones, each with own regulations, has created a compliance nightmare for every PH and outfitter. Without a functional system, the industry will eventually be forced to close down. We do all we can to communicate with government to ensure that

Continued on Page 13

Continued from Page 12

8 The Professional Hunting Industry in South Africa: History & Future

this danger is seen. The new gun legislation has the potential to destroy the industry. Many foreign clients vowed never to return to SA after long delays and rough handling at our airports, many times coupled with insinuation for bribery. The issuance of licenses and renewals for local hunters and gun owners is not keeping pace with demand. Without rifles we cannot hunt, without new hunters the industry will stagnate and die. If the relevant authorities cannot perform their functions efficiently, they will ultimately fail conservation. How do we get government to cooperate with our industry? We have to transform trophy hunting so that the government can be proud of it, that they can promote it openly and honestly. It must become an industry that government wants to be involved in for the benefit of all South Africans. Currently this is not the case; and the hunting industry is at fault for not having addressed the issues earlier.

We have to clean up our act. Hunting must be understandable and acceptable to the public. PHASA has embedded in its constitution a high level of sportsmanship. Our code of conduct and constitution are aimed at keeping hunting clean and wholesome. To this end PHASA has taken a very strong stand against the hunting of captive bred lions and we reject the hunting of any captive bred large predator under any conditions. This is taking a higher ethical stance than the proposed government draft document relating to the same issue. We don't want canned lions! It discredits hunting and it serves no conservation purpose!

The industry must be seen to have teeth. PHASA is currently, at substantial cost to the organization, taking disciplinary action against some members for various offences. It is vital PHASA has disciplinary ability to protect our good members and to protect the industry. There has been an inability by some of the provinces to act against "hunting rogues". Hopefully here in Limpopo this will be coming to an end as PHASA and the Department have pledged to work together to clean out unethical hunting in the industry and corruption in the province. Once again, it is imperative that the public, ourselves and our clients, see that there are lines that cannot be crossed without consequences.

Secondly, we have to make hunting belong to all the people of SA. This is a huge challenge for an industry which has traditionally catered for the wealthy white client by white outfitters. PHASA has developed its draft BEE Policy which incentivizes members to empower and to contribute to PHASA's empowerment efforts. Once again we hope to work with government to identify empowerment opportunities within the professional hunting industry, for the development and upliftment of a broad base of black folk who previously were not given the opportunities we whites had. We will do this in a manner that will uplift the industry and that will be for the benefit of all parties, and for the benefit of conservation. There are many state concessions and tribal lands which can contribute substantially in this regard.

Lastly, we have to market hunting to the public. We need to educate the public as to the role hunting plays in conservation and we have to show examples of the correct way to hunt. This will mean we have to engage the media on all fronts and to do this we must not have anything to hide.

Without the professional hunting industry, the game auction of this weekend would be valueless and would generate very little for the province. When I started game ranching back in 1986, Nature Conservation was virtually giving away excess game as there was little demand. It has been the paying hunter who has created the demand. It is absolutely essential that the provinces are part of growing our industry. They control so many aspects of our industry and without their cooperation and help it will grind to a halt. The provincial reserves and community land hold much value that can be developed through professional hunting. There is a desperate need to share the benefits of hunting with PDIs and to involve and educate them, so that they can manage and grow their wildlife heritage and generate economic benefits too.

Namibia's professional hunting industry has a wonderful relationship with the government. The Namibian president is a member of NAPHA and participates in the annual conventions. He is a hunter himself. Currently the numbers of foreign hunters in Namibia are soaring, so much so that 2 extra international flights a week have been scheduled to cope with demand. At the same time, SAA are losing seats because of our gun legislation. Hunters to other SADC countries are often choosing to fly via Namibia to avoid the frustration of transferring guns through our airports.

Another challenge or opportunity for the industry is to get black people to enjoy hunting. It must not be for the white elite, everybody must be able to enjoy this wonderful sport. A speaker at our last convention, Rev Mahana, drew the parallel with golf. How many black people actually played golf prior 1994? Hardly any, and now all the executives play. It is *en vogue*. So can hunting become the recreational pastime of black corporate South Africa. This is a challenge to all hunters and not only to us involved in professional hunting.

It must be remembered, that if game is not utilized for profit, its economic value will deteriorate and many private farms will be driven back to stock farming by economics alone. It is therefore vital, that the province assists to maintain and grow the value of our wildlife and wildlife areas. Hunting is the best tool to do this.

The revenue generated from the game auction this week, is entirely dependent upon the health of the hunting industry. Game auctions countrywide are a barometer of the health of the hunting industry. Let's hope that it grows from year to year. All of us in the professional hunting industry need to join hands with government and work together to realize the enormous potential of this wonderful and exciting industry, for the benefit of all South Africans.

Editor's Note: At the Limpopo Wildlife Expo, Premier Moloto called for an increase in training facilities within the wildlife industry to enable more people to obtain employment in the sector. Mr Moloto said stronger partnerships had to be built between the wildlife industry and communities living along boundaries of protected areas. "Our parks will not be sustainable if the needs of the people living in surrounding areas are ignored," he insisted. Collin Chabane MEC for Economic Development, Environment and Tourism, told the delegates that elements of the Black Economic Empowerment (BEE) Charter for Tourism would be introduced in the province. He said that in-depth talks with representatives of the hunting industry will be held to create greater access for black people to this sector.

Continued from Page 2

1 Hunting in South Africa: Facts, Risks, Opportunities

accounts for almost 40% of the total revenue stream, with game rich Limpopo a distant second with 25%. It is quite astonishing to see that hunters visiting the Eastern Cape spent an average of 21 days on safari, whereas six other provinces show an average between 6 and 8 days (Western Cape and Gauteng with their limited hunting offer are at 4.6 resp. 3.2 days)! If one compares the number of animals hunted within the provincial borders (Eastern Cape 16,102; Limpopo 18,815) the relation is reversed! A client hunter in Limpopo took on average 16 animals on a safari which lasted about 8 days, whereas his counterpart in the Eastern Cape took 8 animals on a safari of almost 21 days duration. For 2002/2003 the same source reported 7.6 animals taken by each client in the Eastern Cape (with 16 days average safari length) and 8.2 animals for each visiting hunter in Limpopo (9 days average safari). The 2003/2004 statistics post an average trophy fee of \$1,144 for the Eastern Cape versus Limpopo with \$792 and the overall average of \$756. That does not look plausible. According to the same statistics, observers (i. e. persons who accompany the hunter) are only attributed 15% of the hunter-days; this seems to be a serious under-estimation.

Unfortunately there are no authoritative statistical figures available from other sources, but I suggest that most likely not all hunting (daily fees as well as trophies taken) by visiting hunters from overseas is correctly reflected. It is high time that regulatory steps are taken to rectify this issue. Since professional hunters and safari operators have to complete already now detailed reporting sheets – the question is whether there are loop holes in the reporting and/or inadequacies in the data collection and interpretation.

In my own investigation regarding the economic contribution of the professional hunting industry I have used a number of parameters – all of them very conservative taking the lower end of a possible spread into consideration.

I assumed that South Africa had 8000 visiting hunters in 2004, who paid an average daily rate of \$350 (excl. VAT) for a safari with an average length of 10 days. These hunters take on average 9 trophy animals with an average trophy fee of \$800 (no VAT on trophy fees). My evaluations excluded the rapidly growing wing-shooting sector, since no figures were available.

I also included 3500 observers at \$150 (excl. VAT) per day for 10 days average. This brings a total of approximately 91 million dollars – 23 million dollars more than the provincial statistics. Additionally the property owners usually keep the venison of the animals hunted – at a conservative rate of 50 kg venison per animal taken and a price of 10 R/Kg the value of this venison for human consumption approaches R36 million per year.

I suggest that my estimates – conservative as they may be – are plausible especially when compared with the findings of the ABSA study "Game Ranch Profitability in Southern Africa (2003)", with Makombe (1993) who stated that more than 6,250 hunters visited South Africa per year bringing \$69.3 million and with TRAFFIC (2001), which cites Hoogkamer giving a value of ca 18.4 million

Continued on Page 16

Continued from Page 9

5 Hunting, Sustainability & Property Rights in East and Southern Africa

sector are likely to resist independent certification, we note that informal means of 'certification' are already being used. Namibia's recent success at CITES CoP 13 in having its hunting and wildlife trade proposals for rhinos and elephants approved results largely from the international community 'rewarding' Namibia for sustainable management practices which have led to increasing wildlife. Countries where wildlife is declining are less likely to find favor among international regulatory bodies for their trade requests; Namibia has been 'certified' whereas Tanzania might not be.

The practicality, both political and technical, of developing certification schemes for trophy hunting may provide a concrete agenda around which discussions of trophy hunting's sustainability and reform can coalesce. Many lessons have been learned in the past decade from similar efforts to certify forest and marine products. Key questions in applying this to wildlife might include:

- ❖ What should certification consist of?
- ❖ What are the appropriate bodies to determine criteria and grant or deny certification?
- ❖ How might such efforts be made most effective and accepted by a wide range of stakeholders?

Aldo Leopold, the American conservationist who formulated many of the basic principles of game management in the 1930's, said that "conservation will ultimately boil down to rewarding the private landowner who conserves the public interest." In Africa today, the countries that have succeeded in empowering and 'rewarding' private landholders through control over wildlife and its values are those which have the most sustainable wildlife management systems and trophy hunting industries. A combination of collaborative policy reform efforts and independent certification schemes for well-managed countries and operations will give hunting in Africa the best chance of flourishing in the face of its many threats and challenges.

The authors are from Sand County Foundation Community Based Conservation Network, Tanzania Program, Box 8372, Arusha, Tanzania; contact Fred Nelson fnelson@habari.co.tz

"Hunting is not merely an acquired taste; the instinct that finds delight in the sight and pursuit of game is bred into the very fiber of this race. Some can live without opportunity for this exercise and control of the hunting instinct, just as I suppose some can live without work, play, love, business, or other vital adventures. But in these days we regard such deprivations as unsocial. Opportunity for exercise of all the normal instincts has come to be regarded more and more as an inalienable right."

Aldo Leopold

"In hunting, the finding (chase) and killing of the game is after all but a part of the whole"

Theodore Roosevelt

"Hunting is a process, not an event"

Russell Thornberry

9 A Strategy To Secure The Right To Hunt

By Ludolph Swanevelder, National Chair, Confederation of Hunting Associations of South Africa (CHASA)

Living in the information era, we are bombarded with information at a mind boggling pace. Strategists have the challenge to filter from this a picture that represents reality as it is of relevance to an evaluation of their area of concern. The question now is: What is reality as applicable to the future of hunting?

The threat to habitat is growing. An increase in population densities have as a result the converting of 'natural' habitat to 'human only' habitat, with a resultant threat to biodiversity. People in general realize this, and there is growing support for some form of conservation. Unfortunately the instinctive choice, especially to urbanites, is to go the way of 'non-use'. And non-use proponents have it wrong. We can only conserve successfully by taking the scientific and non-emotional approach of sustainable utilization.

Animal rightists have the resources. They form part of the global conflict movement that build semiprivate financial empires in the process of fighting popular issues. The top four international animal rights organizations have a combined yearly budget of \$103m. And they have a shrewd strategy. They identify hunting practices that border on the unethical and then work on gaining visual material for a television expose on it e.g. the Cook report on canned lion hunting. This garners emotional public support which allows them to define the practice that it includes also the ethical version of that practice. Next comes the domino effect. They now build on their success in having defined canned lion hunting, to also include other species. They have already labeled bred-for-release bird hunting as 'canned'. Next all rhino hunting will be claimed canned. Then they will build on these successes by claiming hunting on small ranches to be canned. First ranches smaller than 500ha, then 1000ha, then 5000ha.

Hunting associations are cultural organizations. We are, in fact, by far the largest cultural organizations in the country. Hunting might be the common denominator, but the distinguishing factor is really the theme of 'ethical hunting'. Unfortunately, ethical hunting and fair chase cannot be cast in a set of rules. Different cultures view ethics differently. And as hunting practices change from desert to bushveld, so does ethical hunting mean different things in different areas of our land.

The next step in designing an effective strategy, is defining a vision of the ideal end state. For hunters the ideal environment will be one with a distinct positive attitude to pro-use, politically and socially. Scientists and conservationists in government organizations are certainly in favor of sustainable utilization. The politicians, however, are not easily convinced to act in the interest of sustainable use. The reason is one of sensitivity to public opinion. Animal rights proponents are so verbal that the perception with decision makers is that the general public might have an instinctive (even if in error) bias towards non-use. Ideally, public opinion should lean heavily in favor of sustainable use, if not outright in favor of hunting. This can only be achieved by an active campaign to project a positive image of hunting and hunters. Which brings

us to the establishment of the strategy: Organized hunting should have a two legged strategy in securing the right to hunt:

On grassroots level, as cultural organizations, hunting associations should offer members a form of union, enjoyment, excitement and value for money. Enthusiastic hunters should not be bored with political strategy and the antics of the animal rights activists. Rather ensure, through excitement in hunting, that we popularize hunting and bolster numbers. Numbers is what counts in a democracy and CHASA currently represents only 35'000 out of an accepted figure of 200'000 hunters.

Hunting is a form of escaping the modern world of grit and conflict. The global conflict movement is the last thing that a recreational hunter should be troubled with when he escapes to the hunting field. Enjoyment of organized hunting will also ensure that we perpetuate the hunting heritage. We should excite and train our youth to carry on the tradition of hunting.

Through this strategy of exciting and strong associations, can we also establish a common culture and a culture of ethical hunting. Even if we only define 'ethical' as subscribing to 'a standard' or 'a code'! This attitude and the resultant conduct are essential in promoting a positive image of hunting and the hunter. Ethical hunting is not only a mind set. It also requires some form of capacity on the side of the hunter, especially when the principle of fair chase is at stake. When training and practice become a social and enjoyable experience, we can create competent hunters, which in turn have the capacity to hunt ethically and fair.

The second leg of our approach is confined to the management level. Here we should focus on establishing a capacity lobby. I am of the opinion that, individually, South Africa's sustainable use associations do not possess the resources to achieve this. Combined, however, we certainly do! A combined industry, representing game farmers, hunters and professionals will also empower us to take a pro-active and united stance on conservation issues. Accepted standards and practices which leave no room for exploitation. We should be first in defining the meaning of practices like e.g. canned shooting

The 15 person strong National Advisory Council for the Environment was announced on 24 February by the Minister of Environmental Affairs and Tourism. The role of this council is to involve stake holders in the environmental decision making process. It is an absolute tragedy that utilization associations have no representation in this Council. This sad state of affairs must be corrected at the first possible opportunity. Will a strategy of a united lobby ensure that? I firmly believe it will.

The **Confederation of Hunting Associations of South Africa (CHASA)** was established in 1980 to represent regional hunting organizations on a national basis. Today it has 19 member associations with 14,000 individual members. Mission: to promote sustainable ethical hunting through leadership and the coordination of activities of member associations. Objectives: Conservation through sustainable utilization; a culture of ethical hunting; standardization in products and outputs; representation of hunters at national level; excellence in education and training; building the image of the hunter.

Continued from Page 14

1 Hunting in South Africa: Facts, Risks, Opportunities

dollars for 25,000 hunted animals for the 1999 season.

Taking into account multiplier effects like taxidermy, pre-and post safari accommodation/shopping, tips to staff, venison value and airfares (the later based only on 4000 visitors using SAA at \$1200 a return ticket) my figures translate into a FOREX volume of about \$137 million (R890 million @ 6.50). Each of the 8000 visiting hunters therefore creates a revenue stream of over \$17,000. Very little of this goes offshore – I suggest that only about 7% of the total daily rates are paid to non South Africans.

For the local hunting market I have no detailed statistics. I assumed for South Africa about 200,000 local hunters (50,000 of those dedicated, the rest occasional hunters). I further assumed that 25,000 dedicated hunters spend R20,000 for trophy fees & daily rates, and 25,000 of them about R10,000 each. The remaining 150,000 "occasional hunters" are very conservatively assumed to spend R2,000 per person/year. With the multiplier effects of association membership fees, equipment purchase, transport, taxidermy, etc. and applicable VAT this sector accounts for more than R2 billion (Van der Merwe & Saayman established an average expenditure figure for 10,000 hunters in the Northwest Province at just under R10,000 each).

The market for live game (surplus game captured in one area and released in another area) had a total volume in 2004 in the region of R130 million (documented auction sales plus estimated private sales). We have to add the cost of game capture, transport, insurance and other multiplier effects to this amount.

When writing this article, current figures for the value of venison from culling and cropping operations for local use and export were not available. Peter Flack wrote in the first issue of African Indaba (Vol1/1) that Camdeboo Meat Processors culled 65,000 head of game in 2001 which represented about 80% of all game professionally culled in and exported from South Africa, generating a turnover of about R28 million. At least we have a base reference. Flack mentioned in personal communication that the value of the venison export market could and should be much higher.

The total investment of the private sector in game ranching is probably higher than R20 billion (the State, provinces and communities as landowners of a number of conservation areas designated for sustainable consumptive use are not included). There are currently about 6,000 game ranches with "exemption" and probably another 4,000 mixed game and livestock ranches in South Africa. These ranches cover more than double the land of all declared protected areas. The hunting and game ranching industry consists of a complex arrangement of stakeholders and auxiliary industries; a multitude of interactions creates an entire palette of multiplier effects which give the sector an extremely important impact on the national economy. The sector also has an equally important impact on national conservation efforts.

It would be an interesting and rewarding exercise for a group of researchers (i.e. the Institute for Tourism Management, Wildlife Economics and Leisure Studies at the North-West University) to evaluate this important market in detail and fill the knowledge gaps with reliable information and statistics drawn from common

and verifiable databases.

Just as a footnote some interesting figures: in the USA hunting expenditure was \$21 billion in 2002 (USF&W); in Germany 340,000 hunters generated a total of \$900 million; in France 1.3 million hunters generated \$2.4 billion and in Austria 115,000 hunters \$570 million (all European figures from FACE).

3. Risks & Opportunities

3.1. Game Prices & Trophy Fees

The conversion of live stock ranches to extensive game ranches has slowed. This process boomed during the last four decades, but now the supply of suitable land is slowly tapering off. Many existing private and public game (conservation) areas are running either close to, or even over maximum ecological carrying capacity. Most are certainly at or above the maximum sustainable yield level and therefore have turned from buyers to suppliers. As a consequence there is an oversupply of live game, prices stagnate and are in danger of declining. This conclusion can be drawn from statistics previously published in African Indaba (see archives 2005 at www.africanindaba.co.za). An example is the well-known Ezemvelo KZN Wildlife Auction. In 2003 the auction brought in R23 million, 2004 the total stood at R9.4 million and the May 2005 auction realized R9.1 million.

Game ranchers – and also those national and provincial authorities who sell surplus live game – must recognize this trend. With the exception of a few rare species or special cases live game prices are declining and alternative economic solutions have to be found. Trophy hunting and game culling/cropping offer some possibilities:

- a) Trophy fees for overseas hunters are significantly higher than average live game prices (the difference is even bigger, when factoring in the cost of capturing, transport, insurance, veterinary expenses, etc). Even the considerably lower trophy and/or biltong fees for local hunters are now often higher;
- b) Venison must be promoted as acceptable and healthy meat on the local meat retail and restaurant markets. A regulatory frame work and marketing platform for significantly increasing the EU export sales is essential. Venison is a valuable (and under-priced as compared to lamb, pork or beef) hormone-free organic product with a low fat, sodium and cholesterol index for the health conscious. Besides biltong and wors, thousands of recipes are available for tasty dishes.

3.2. Two Key Species

South Africa's game areas offer a number of key species to the international hunter. Some of them occur only, others are huntable only in South Africa. Regulatory frame works to safeguard the conservation of these species within healthy habitats and to maximize the economic benefit from their sustainable use are essential. I will discuss only two species here due to space restrictions, but invite comments regarding these and other species for future issues of African Indaba:

Black Rhino

The CITES decision to grant South Africa the right to hunt re-

Continued on Page 18

Hunting Fees (Trophy & Daily Rate) in South Africa 2005						
Species	Highest Price	Lowest Price	Average Individual Price ¹	Median Individual Price ²	2004 Live Sale Average ³	2004/2005 Males Live Sale Average ⁴
African Wild Cat	\$750	\$150	\$405	\$400	\$159	n/a
Baboon	\$330	\$0	\$108	\$100	n/a	n/a
Blesbuck	\$1,563	\$123	\$369	\$350	\$118	\$151
Blesbuck, White	\$1,790	\$246	\$693	\$668	\$178	n/a
Bontebok	\$3,500	\$800	\$1,466	\$1,400	\$1,475	\$1,308
Buffalo, Cape	\$18,750	\$6,000	\$11,064	\$10,650	\$23,608	\$7,264
Bushbuck Limpopo & Cape	\$1,290	\$280	\$726	\$700	\$385	\$569
Bushpig	\$950	\$100	\$398	\$375	\$428	n/a
Caracal (Lynx)	\$1,500	-\$30	\$545	\$500	n/a	n/a
Civet	\$1,000	\$50	\$412	\$350	n/a	n/a
Crocodile	\$6,000	\$2,500	\$3,720	\$3,500	n/a	n/a
Duiker, Blue	\$1,500	\$420	\$881	\$875	\$587	n/a
Duiker, Grey	\$575	\$70	\$261	\$250	\$347	n/a
Duiker, Red	\$2,500	\$600	\$989	\$950	\$634	n/a
Eland, Cape	\$3,500	\$950	\$1,824	\$1,800	\$696	\$1,144
Eland, Livingstone	\$3,750	\$1,800	\$2,525	\$2,375	\$1,616	\$1,636
Fallow Deer	\$1,000	\$185	\$570	\$550	n/a	\$169
Gemsbok	\$1,875	\$588	\$1,032	\$1,000	\$558	\$613
Genet	\$750	\$50	\$212	\$150	n/a	n/a
Giraffe	\$4,500	\$1,650	\$2,807	\$2,750	\$2,210	\$1,750
Grysbuck, Cape	\$1,500	\$300	\$806	\$750	\$225	n/a
Grysbuck, Sharpe's	\$1,800	\$500	\$971	\$950	n/a	n/a
Hartebeest, Cape	\$1,790	\$500	\$927	\$900	\$533	\$562
Hippopotamus	\$6,500	\$2,500	\$5,343	\$5,810	\$5,015	n/a
Honeybadger	\$550	\$50	\$368	\$400	n/a	n/a
Hyena, Brown	\$2,750	\$250	\$950	\$748	n/a	n/a
Hyena, Spotted	\$2,500	\$95	\$827	\$700	\$79	n/a
Impala	\$675	\$146	\$327	\$325	\$101	\$173
Jackal, Blackbacked	\$350	-\$20	\$91	\$80	n/a	n/a
Klipspringer	\$1,500	\$300	\$819	\$750	\$608	n/a
Kudu, Southern & Cape	\$3,475	\$538	\$1,285	\$1,200	\$322	\$889
Lechwe, Kafue	\$4,500	\$1,900	\$3,433	\$3,900	n/a	n/a
Lechwe, Red	\$4,500	\$1,400	\$2,684	\$2,500	\$2,222	\$1,635
Leopard	\$12,500	\$2,500	\$5,289	\$5,000	n/a	n/a
Lion	\$29,500	\$15,000	\$23,646	\$25,000	n/a	n/a
Monkey, Blue	\$350	\$20	\$74	\$50	n/a	n/a
Nyala	\$3,500	\$1,000	\$2,243	\$2,250	\$1,031	\$1,430
Oribi	\$3,500	\$500	\$1,192	\$1,000	\$793	n/a
Ostrich	\$1,500	\$50	\$555	\$550	\$189	n/a
Porcupine	\$250	\$0	\$123	\$100	n/a	n/a
Reedbuck, Common	\$1,590	\$330	\$818	\$800	\$701	n/a
Reedbuck, Mountain	\$1,590	\$115	\$585	\$550	\$202	n/a
Rhebuck, Vaal	\$1,990	\$500	\$974	\$950	\$687	n/a
Rhino	\$46,154	\$25,000	\$35,193	\$36,500	\$17,881	\$11,526
Roan	\$11,350	\$9,000	\$9,963	\$9,750	\$23,712	\$4,152
Sable	\$12,000	\$4,000	\$7,674	\$8,000	\$9,772	\$3,442
Scimitar Horned Oryx	\$9,000	\$2,500	\$5,300	\$5,000	\$2,273	n/a
Serval	\$1,750	\$200	\$607	\$488	n/a	n/a
Springbuck, Black	\$1,200	\$185	\$589	\$600	\$145	\$231
Springbuck, Cape & Kalahari	\$675	\$92	\$336	\$350	\$83	\$145
Springbuck, White	\$1,500	\$400	\$834	\$800	\$447	\$651
Springhare	\$150	\$25	\$62	\$50	n/a	n/a
Steenbuck	\$750	\$90	\$283	\$278	\$207	n/a
Suni, Livingstone's	\$3,500	\$650	\$1,324	\$1,200	n/a	n/a
Tsessebee	\$6,000	\$750	\$2,613	\$2,500	\$3,033	\$1,638
Warthog	\$600	\$80	\$299	\$300	\$114	n/a

African Indaba is a e-newsletter for hunter-conservationists and all people who are interested in the conservation, management and the sustainable use of Africa's wild natural resources

Hunting Fees (Trophy & Daily Rate) in South Africa (continued)						
Species	Highest Price	Lowest Price	Average Individual Price ¹	Median Individual Price ²	2004 Live Sale Average ³	2004/2005 Males Live Sale Average ⁴
Waterbuck, Common	\$2,800	\$370	\$1,671	\$1,613	\$791	\$994
Wildebeest, Black	\$1,790	\$462	\$954	\$950	\$285	\$438
Wildebeest, Blue	\$1,790	\$415	\$883	\$850	\$259	\$372
Zebra, Burchell's	\$1,890	\$530	\$1,023	\$1,000	\$728	\$692
Zebra, Cape Mountain	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	n/a	n/a
Zebra, Hartmann's	\$6,550	\$688	\$2,247	\$1,550	\$2,847	\$1,077
Daily Rate, Plains Game	\$600	\$100	\$360	\$350	-	-
Daily Rate, Big Five	\$1,650	\$400	\$670	\$600	-	-
Daily Rate, Observer	\$308	\$65	\$163	\$150	-	-

¹ Average Price: The mathematical average of all individual prices ² Median Price: This is the price exactly in the middle of the range of prices evaluated; half the prices are higher, half are lower than the median ³ Source: Northwest University - Prof T Eloff @ 2004 Average Rate 6.3057 ⁴ Source: Game & Hunt Auction Results @ 6.50 Ex Rate (May 2005)

Remarks: Elephant has not been included since no prices were available on the web; freak color variations or hybrids have also not been included although some are offered; the lion on offer are most likely in their majority captive bred (canned lion). Please read and interpret this sheet only in conjunction with the relevant article in African Indaba Vol 3, page 18.
Copyright: African Indaba

Continued from Page 16

1 Hunting in South Africa: Facts, Risks, Opportunities

dundant male individuals was overdue and will have a positive effect on black rhino conservation. I limit myself here only to the discussion of conservation beneficial marketing options.

Black rhino conservation is of national importance and incurs high cost to the taxpayer. The animals are notoriously more aggressive and less visible than white rhino and therefore are less suitable for non-consumptive eco-tourism. Consumptive sustainable use of a five adult bulls is ideal to raise substantial funds for rhino conservation.

The government tag auctions of the Foundation for North American Wild Sheep (FNAWS) for Rocky Mountain and Desert Bighorn sheep give a good benchmark. Some of these hunts were auctioned at prices in excess of \$400,000!

The handling of the 5 black rhino permits for 2005 by DEAT left – in my opinion – much to be desired. National and international hunting organizations could have contributed their expertise to the process, but were not consulted. The ideal approach could have been:

- **For the first year (2005):** Only allow hunting for rhino which are owned and managed by Provincial or National Authorities and market these hunts with international raffles and/or auctions to maximize economic return with the net proceeds going directly into black rhino conservation
- Have PHASA appoint – through an appropriate selection process – a number of highly qualified and suitable outfitters/professional hunters to conduct these hunts and have PHASA define concrete fair chase guidelines.
- Cooperate internationally (with USF&W and EU Commission) to regulate the export/import of black rhino trophies and create a system to micro-chip legally obtained trophies for instant recognition
- **For subsequent years:** permit selected private and/or community owners to hunt a determined number on their land, apart from continuing to provide black rhino hunting opportunities from national or provincial stock

- Set a minimum percentage of the realized price of privately-owned animals as mandatory contribution to national black rhino projects
- Sell the private hunts on the open market and make one or two auction/raffle permits available at minimum reserve prices for those black rhino coming from national or provincial stock

I am sure that these or similar arrangements would have resulted in realizing more than \$2 million for 2005 – FOR CONSERVATION and TAX PAYER COST REDUCTION! There may be still a window of opportunity open to do so, but then DEAT and the Provincial authorities have to react fast.

Leopard

CoP 13 endorsed South Africa's request to increase yearly leopard trophy exports from 75 to 150. The original application and the sovereign CITES decision was opposed by certain groups in South Africa questioning the underlying scientific data. According to the 21st CITES Animal Committee Meeting (source: official CITES document, 05/2005) DEAT, who allocates the leopard quota to the provinces, requested the Endangered Wildlife Trust (EWT) to do a Population and Habitat Viability Assessment (PHVA) to assist in allocating the additional quota in an appropriate manner to the various areas where leopards occur. The PHVA for leopards should develop a strategic recovery/conservation plan including: collating all available information on local Leopard populations, threats, trends, habitat and distribution; determining which management and conservation options are the most feasible; model these against future scenarios to produce guidelines as to where conservation efforts and actions should be directed; and engaging the broadest stakeholder forum possible in taking appropriate conservation and management decisions. A computer-based model (VORTEX) is used to test different management scenarios and to forecast the current and future risk of population decline and/or extinction. DEAT is expecting the outcome in August.

Unfortunately, incomplete reports have been published prior to

Continued on Page 19

Continued from Page 18

1 Hunting in South Africa: Facts, Risks, Opportunities

the final report (see the interview with one of the workshop organizers, Yolan Friedman, in "Endangered Wildlife" No 52/2005 and <http://www.cbsg.org/news/index.scd>). These untimely publications stressed that increased controlled off-take is not advisable at present, without mentioning that the new quota could indeed be sustainable under well regulated and controlled conditions.

Let me be specific: Researchers agree that absolute leopard numbers are difficult if not impossible to determine due to the secretive habits. Requesting the expenditure of huge sums and valuable research time on a task which has been recognized as extremely difficult is bad management.

Martin & De Meulenaer said 1988 that leopard populations are able to easily compensate reasonable harvesting. Even substantially decreased populations will recover maximal density when the off-take is stopped. Several of their peer reviewers considered that trophy hunting, properly controlled, was both possible and even advisable.

Evidence presented during the PHVA indicates that by and large leopard's populations are doing well in South Africa, and analysis conducted suggested that leopard populations in South Africa could sustain the current, as well as an increased off-take. There were also suggestions that leopard populations in the Waterberg and Mpumalanga escarpment would decline if the quota were increased, whereas those in the North-West and Limpopo Provinces could support higher quotas.

Bailey (1993) estimates leopard population densities at 3.5 adults per 100 km², with much higher densities of up to 30.3 per 100 km² in the riparian forest zones with high prey density. Based on these figures and available leopard habitat in Limpopo, a minimum of approx 1750, maybe as many as 2500 leopard could occur there alone. With high prey density on most game farms leopard numbers should also have increased substantially in KwaZulu-Natal, Eastern Cape and some areas in Mpumalanga. I suggest that there are sufficient leopard in South Africa to allow a sustainable quota of 150 – in fact I believe that this quota is on the conservative side!

The work of Whitman et al. (Nature 2004) has shown that lion trophy hunting can be sustainable simply by limiting hunting to males above a certain age. Being similar in many demographic respects to lions sustainable lion hunting strategies could be applied to leopards especially given the virtual impossibility of counting leopards (Dr Paul Funston – pers. comm., 2005). This point is reinforced because leopards show sex dependent mortality (Bailey 1993). Males suffer a mortality rate at 25% per year, whereas female mortality rate is only 13%. Restricting shooting to males only may lower the mortality rate induced by other males, making hunting off-take of males [at least partially] compensatory. At a lowered male density, remaining males will simply mate with more females (Spong et al, 2000).

The legal off-take of leopard in South Africa approached 70 p. a. in the past years, and most likely around another 50 each were taken illegally and with permits as problem animals.

Conclusion: South Africa's quota of 150 leopard is sustainable. Hunting should be limited to males above a certain age

(probably around 4 years) to guarantee this sustainability. Part of the new quota would be compensated by natural mortality, another part with a reduced number of problem animals taken by land owners, who should be incentivized by the authorities to sell the hunting opportunity. To specifically target problem leopards hunting methods like the much maligned leopard hunting with hounds should be reassessed, since with this method specific individuals can be targeted. The issue boils down to adaptive management, where several sets of data (ongoing research, harvest figures, etc.) are centrally monitored and the results applied to future actions.

It is however essential that a concise regulatory frame work be put in place first. This is largely the responsibility of DEAT and the provincial authorities, but PHASA (and possibly some international hunting associations) must be empowered to play a vital role in this process. Within this frame work, I can imagine a compulsory presentation of the skull and skin (with the scrotum being integral part of the skin) of any hunted leopard to the authorities before the permit is validated. There are proven methods to determine the animal's age by the cementum layers of upper second premolar tooth. I can also imagine that professional hunters and/or operators responsible for killing female leopard will be sanctioned by being excluded for eligibility for new permits for a certain period and those who consistently harvest right-age male leopard being incentivized with additional permits. A further incentive would be the presentation of a certificate to the hunter that the leopard was hunted as part of a South African Leopard Conservation Program (this could be coupled with a fixed hunter-donation to a leopard research fund of \$500 thus creating an annual disposable fund for leopard research of \$75,000)! Last not least, areas where leopard populations are considered vulnerable (like the Mpumalanga escarpment and the Waterberg) only very conservative quotas should be allocated until a positive trend is established.

Professional hunters have to shoulder the responsibility to take the extra effort to distinguish males and females and judging the age in the field prior to giving the permission to shoot. Leopards show size dimorphism, but large females may easily be mistaken for small males if one relies only on size. The only certain way of sexing leopards is to confirm the presence (or absence) of primary sexual characters like scrotum or nipples. This is difficult, but not impossible, it may however implicate to forego a shooting opportunity – but this is hunting, isn't it?

It would mean a greater hunter effort and longer safaris. Hunters must see that it is just not wise, neither economically nor ecologically to hunt female leopard (Funston – pers. comm..2005).

Part Two of this article will appear in the next issue

... I thought how curious it is that the people who love animals most are often they that hunt them. There are the maddening theorists in the world who will not admit of such a paradox. Yet who knows more of the ways of birds and beast than the gamekeeper? ... We hunt what we love, because we want to possess it.

Vivienne de Watteville in "Speak to the Earth"

13 Tanzania: Game Scouts Shoot Hundredpounder

By Rolf D. Baldus

It took four shots from a worn out Governmental issue .458 to put down Tanzania's first hundredpounder elephant after nearly two decades. The last two had been shot by tourist hunters in 1983 and 1986 in the Selous Game Reserve. The grotesque drama took place in Mbinga District, the most south-western corner of Tanzania, which borders Mozambique and Lake Malawi.

Elephants have given way here to cultivation long time ago and those who stayed were poached out in the eighties. Therefore crowds of people gathered and watched the spectacle when a huge elephant appeared one morning in Ruhehe village. Youths threw stones, and later in the day 19 year old Lazaro Ntunguru climbed a small tree close to the animal. According to the official report by the Wildlife office in Mbinga he clubbed the tusker on the head with a knobbed stick. Being so unpleasantly disturbed, the elephant bull grabbed the unfortunate young fellow with the trunk, smashed him against the tree and stepped on him. Death had been immediate according to a medical doctor.

The elephant left and destroyed in the following days several hectares of crops. On May 8th two game scouts who had been dispatched by Mbinga District authorities shot the bull at 2 pm in Uzena village. The District Game Officer, P.H. Ndimbo said that the tusks weighed 47 and 48 kg respectively, had a length of 225 cm and a circumference of 50 cm at the bottom.

(Photo at <http://www.africanindaba.co.za/photographs.htm>)

2005 SAWMA Symposium

The Southern African Wildlife Management Association (SAWMA) holds the 2005 symposium from 2-4 October 2005 at Magoebaskloof (385km north of Johannesburg). The main theme of the symposium is "**Wildlife Management, a Conservation or Economic Incentive?**" with the following sub themes:

1. Economics versus conservation
2. Guiding wildlife management
3. Threats and monitoring
4. Benefits from utilization
5. Land reform: impacts on wildlife

Select between two main registration options to attend the full symposium from Sunday evening to Tuesday afternoon. In option one all accommodation at the hotel as well as all meals and conference registration fees are included; different alternatives running from R1,150 to R1,700 are available. Option two includes only the conference registration fee and meals & teas with alternatives from Rand 930 to R1,050. Day delegates have to pay R 500 per day.

You can register by 31 August 2005 online at <http://www.sawma.co.za> or through the SAWMA office (Elma Marais). Email elma@mweb.co.za, fax: 0866729882 or postal mail: P.O. Box 217, Bloubergstrand 7436, RSA

14 African Indaba Congratulates Brian Nicholson

By Dr Rolf Baldus

One of the founders of modern hunting tourism, Brian Nicholson, turned 75. Brian made his home in Australia since he retired as a tourism and bird shooting guide in Kenya. Brian is undoubtedly the creator of what is the modern Selous Game Reserve. His intimate involvement with this largest and oldest game reserve in Africa spans almost a quarter of a century, from the colonial administration to the transition period and then to the independent Government of the Republic of Tanzania.

He was born on June 20th, 1930 in Eldoret, Kenya. At a time when academic degrees were deemed less important than common sense, bush craft and determination, he became involved in animal capture and professional hunting at the tender age of 17. With 19 he joined the then Tanganyika Game Department as an elephant control officer. He had traveled many thousands of miles through the reserve, mostly on foot until 1973 when he voluntarily resigned from his post of Game Warden, Southern Tanzania. This certainly makes him the person with the most intimate knowledge of the area.

In order to finance the management, infrastructure and anti-poaching operations of the Selous which he had expanded to its present size of nearly 50,000 km², he was able to convince the colonial administration to allow hunting tourism. Brian worked out the details and had soon a flourishing hunting industry which operated on the basis of low and sustainable quotas and strict control. The oppression of poaching soon led to big ivory including hundred-pounders, fine cats and old buffalo bulls being harvested, not to mention the many antelopes. The proceeds from hunting were kept for the upkeep of the game reserve. Unfortunately this strictly controlled system was not continued after his departure.

Brian visited the Selous again in 1979 together with the photographer Hugo van Lawick and the author Peter Matthiessen, who wrote the book "Sand Rivers" about their fascinating foot safari. In 2001 Brian Nicholson's book "The Last of Old Africa" was published by Safari Press. It is a classic African hunting book and amongst the best ones ever published - and his stories have the advantage of being true. Brian still takes an active interest in the future of the Selous.

(For a photo of Brian Nicholson please go to our website at <http://www.africanindaba.co.za/photographs.htm>)

A note to members of SCI in Africa

SCI recently sent an undated letter to all African members alleging that the report of African Indaba Vol 3/2 "SCI African Chapter Dies" is inaccurate. I take full responsibility for this article and state explicitly that the contents are correct. SCI is entitled to have a different view.

Gerhard R Damm