

AFRICAN INDABA

Volume 4, Issue No 3

eNewsletter

May 2006

Dedicated to the People and Wildlife of Africa

1 From the Editor's Desk

In this issue of African Indaba we continue the discussion about hunting inside protected areas with an article by Cleve Cheney, a former Kruger Park Ranger, and the statement of the Game Rangers' Association of Africa. With the contributions in earlier issues we are moving towards a broad-based dialogue.

There are questions regarding what to do with proliferating game populations on finite land and my article on the last page, "Development of Game Prices in South Africa", highlights some concerns. There is also the burning issue of funding African protected areas in view of other important national issues like poverty relief and empowerment of disadvantaged Africans who live next to protected areas. Most importantly, we have to recognize that government funds are scarce and much more needed for instance for pressing health issues like the HIV pandemic.

I have made already some proposals in "[Hunting in South Africa: Facts, Risks, Opportunities](#)" especially with regards to broad based black economic empowerment and how incentive-driven-conservation can assist including the majority of South Africans into the future of biodiversity conservation.

A number of voices from the hunting community will certainly claim that hunting within protected areas and selling live game originating from there constitutes unfair competition for the private game and hunting industries. There will also be outcries from many quarters claiming the "sacrosanct" status our protected areas. Many ecotourism stakeholders will protest, citing their perception of a range of global repercussions. But the problems cannot be wished away – we do not live in a utopian paradise where the lion sleeps next to the lamb.

We need to be pragmatic and veer from single-minded or single-species preservationist objectives towards a comprehensive triple-bottom-line conservation approach tackling the complicated array of social, economic and ecological issues. Look at Namibia's northeastern Caprivi Region and the protected areas of Bwabwata, Mudumu and Mamili. Trophy hunting has played an important income-generating role there, but during the past two years the program has been put on ice unnecessarily. However, according to reports received only days ago, hunting is to resume in August. There are other examples from Europe – for instance Germany, France, Spain and Switzerland were conservation hunting plays its role inside protected areas.

The International Council for Game and Wildlife Conservation (CIC) could be a partner in the search for solutions and I intend to bring this topic to the attention of the delegates during the CIC General Assembly in Cyprus in the first week of May. The "*Draft Regulations on Threatened and Protected species and Draft Norms and Standards for the regulation of the hunting industry*" which the South African Department of Environmental Affairs &

Tourism will present on May 2nd will certainly also be discussed there..

Venison or game meat is still a largely underdeveloped, and more often than not an undeveloped, resource. Be it as low-cost protein supply, for instance from elephant culls, for those living in and around protected areas, or as an income and employment generating industry on private land. The wholesome qualities of venison, its proper preparation and acceptance on the table and its importance in providing food security still leave opportunities to explore. African Indaba has published a couple of topical articles by Dr L Hoffman (University of Stellenbosch) and Dr D Lewis (WCS) already in 2003. There are other important lessons to be learned from Germany, where more than 1.7 million ungulates (roe, deer, wild boar, etc.) are harvested every year by the country's 330,000 hunters. This venison finds its way into tasty dishes on the tables in private households and restaurants.

In this African Indaba, readers will find for the first time articles about falconry, one of the oldest and most traditional forms of hunting, and about the conservation and sustainable use of the sandgrouse. Especially the sandgrouse article by AGRED Director Dr Aldo Berruti coincides nicely with the topic "Conservation of Migratory Birds: A Shared Responsibility" which will

Continued on Page 2

INSIDE THIS ISSUE

1. From the Editor's Desk
2. Hunting in Protected Areas by Cleve Cheney
3. Position on Hunting in South Africa's Protected Areas (Statement by Game Rangers' Association of Africa)
4. News from Africa
5. PHASA Presence at Major US Hunting Shows
6. Dieter Ochsenbein Receives SCI McElroy Award
7. Rebuilding the Wildlife Sector in Zimbabwe (Part 1) by Dr Rolf D Baldus and Dr Graham Child
8. Pierre van der Walt's International Big Bore Cartridge Load Data Collection reviewed by Kenneth Richardson
9. Achim Steiner Nominated New UNEP Chief
10. Nguni Cattle on a Game Farm by Gary van den Berg
11. Kenya: The Example Not to Follow by Ian Parker
12. Hunting Benefits Biodiversity: R D Baldus Interviews Prof. Tim Caro
13. The Legally Structured Role of Hunting in The US and Abroad by John J Jackson, III
14. Falconry, a South African Heritage in the Making by Dr A P F Lombard
15. Namaqua Sandgrouse: A Proposal to Conserve the Unpredictable by Dr Aldo Berruti
16. Development of Game Prices in South Africa by Gerhard R Damm

Continued from Page 1
1 From the Editor's Desk

occupy the delegates at the CIC general assembly.

Our readers will also be interested to know of another CIC initiative in support of sustainable hunting tourism. During the first week of March 2006, six CIC experts met at the IUCN offices in Bonn/Germany to discuss the complicated interactions of global hunting tourism and international sustainability standards. The outcomes of the discussions sketched the first features of a project with the title "supporting a hunting tourism which contributes to wildlife and habitat conservation, benefits people and assures the future of hunting". The final objective will be an evaluation system for conservation hunting or incentive-driven-conservation based on international sustainability standards, accepted by international organizations, and practical proposals for its implementation. A second three-day conference with global expert attendance will be held in Brussels in July this year. The symposium on recreational hunting on October 12th and 13th, 2006 in London (see African Indaba 4/2) organized by the IUCN Sustainable Use Specialist Group, the Zoological Society of London and supported by CIC (with CIC Director Kai Wollscheid on the organization committee) will certainly be a logical and essential continuation of this discussion.

Last not least I would like to use a little of your time for some thoughts on *hunting trophies and trophy hunting*.

In this respect the anthropocentric aspects of the hunt and the underlying motives of the hunter are important. Historically these motives may have been subsistence, spiritual sustenance, initiation rites or the manifestation of power, and so on. In a modern context it is, besides subsistence, mainly the wish for an individualistic outdoor pastime.

The hunter's desire to record (as in remembering) an experience which is individually valuable and important by keeping what is commonly called a *trophy* is certainly legitimate. Such a trophy may be a photo, taxidermy, the preserved skin, horns or other tangible items. The tasteful display of a trophy is a reminder of the hunt and of intensely lived moments; a way of extending the appreciation of the experience and the animal. Therefore, every animal taken is a trophy. It is all the more valuable, if the difficulties associated with acquiring it are exceptional. The earliest surviving hunting trophies are amazingly beautiful prehistoric cave paintings of hunting scenes in the Grotte Chauvet, Altamira and Lascaux. In the third century before Christ, the Greek historian, and Socrates' disciple, Xenophon, described the first hunting safaris to foreign countries in his book *Kynegetikos* (Study on Hunting). Trophy hunting isn't a recent invention of the Euro-American male ego!

The trophy must be the result and not the primary objective of the hunt. The pursuit of an animal that has grown to maturity by having survived both nature's limitations and many hunting seasons reduces the hunter's chances. He needs to invest extra time and energy to take a better specimen, and it means that he could come home empty-handed. This degree of uncertainty, whereby results are subject to opportunity and chance, is of essence. With a self-imposed restriction to hunt uncommon, individual animals, the trophy hunter elevates his personal standards. Thus, the selective seeking of a trophy is consistent with a sensitive hunting ethic.

Yours in Hunting and Conservation

Gerhard R Damm

2 Hunting in Protected Areas

By Cleve Cheney

Editor's Note: With Cleve Cheney's article we continue the discussion about hunting in National Parks. Cleve Cheney is a regular contributor to magazines like Game & Hunt, Africa's Bowhunter, African Archer & Adventurer. He has been in conservation for 27 years. Almost 20 years were spent with the South African National Parks Board - most of this time in the Kruger National Park as a wildlife researcher and wilderness ranger. Cleve has extensive experience in wildlife management, game capture, and hunting, both with bow and rifle. He has been an avid bow hunter for 22 years and his recognized bow hunting course has a reputation for setting the highest of standards. Apart from this, Cleve offers a series of CD-ROM based interactive learning material with individual CDs dealing with issues like tracking skills, dangerous African game, shot placement for guides and hunters, bow hunting guide to Africa, advanced field guiding, managing game farms for bowhunting, wilderness survival, etc. The individual CDs can be ordered directly from Cleve Cheney at cceagleswing@mweb.co.za.

As a trails ranger working in the Kruger National Park, I was often asked the following question: "why can a quota of elephants that are to be culled not be set aside for legal hunting purposes?" I found it very difficult to answer – for three reasons: firstly I owed loyalty to SANParks, secondly the National Parks Act states that no hunting may be allowed in a National Park, and thirdly, I found it very difficult to defend an issue for which there was no real logic.

Emotions aside and looking at the issue realistically one sees that African conservation bodies are in a financial crisis. The main reason for this is that conservation funding by central governments has become a low priority issue in comparison to the pressing social needs of burgeoning human populations. As a result under funded national and provincial conservation agencies are forced to become self-sufficient. This leads to conservation compromises and the very mandate of conservation bodies to manage wild systems responsibly becomes a political casualty as sacrosanct ecological principles are sacrificed to meet budgets. The foundation principle of habitat preservation should never have been sacrificed on the altar of mammon. Destroy habitat and all that follows will die!

Instead of keeping wild areas undeveloped and wild the relentless monster of development rolled on, destroying and devouring more and more habitat. Concessions were sold to the highest bidders and they developed wild lands that were once unspoiled wilderness areas) and by their very presence destroyed the wilderness essence. More roads opened up for game drive vehicles to traverse and to provide access to hitherto inaccessible wild places – inaccessible, other than on foot, that is. More gravel pits were excavated for soil to maintain roads, sewage systems put in place and rubbish disposal pits dug to accommodate the human waste created by the lodges. Traffic levels increased with game drive vehicles and to keep the lodges supplied with guests and provisions. The impact of ecotourism development and operation is significant – a pervasive cancer eat-

Continued on Page 3

Continued from Page 2
2 Hunting in Protected Areas

ing away at wilderness atmosphere and physical habitat.

Accepting the fact that conservation will never again be a high priority in the eyes of African political leaders and that funding from central governments will never amount to much, it is time to get real and do some environmental auditing. What hangs in balance is something that is almost irreplaceable – unspoiled habitat! Animals can be introduced into an area but it is very difficult, if at all possible, to restore pristine habitat. Conservationists and wildlife managers are now faced with a dilemma. How can the biggest amount of money be generated to fund conservation with the least environmental impact?

The time has come to making pragmatic decisions. Wise environmental and wildlife management principles dictate that habitat must enjoy the highest priority. Degraded habitat equates to biodiversity impoverishment. Wise wildlife management practice also suggests that the natural resources should be utilized in a sustainable way.

Let us go back to the surplus elephant and to our original question. What is going to generate the greatest income with the least environmental impact? A hunter shooting an elephant, or a tourist lodge/camp? Let us play with some figures (Rand-Dollar ex-rate based on 6.50):

We assume that the powers that be allocate 100 elephant a year for controlled hunting in the Kruger National Park. The hunter would take the trophy and the meat would be sold to neighboring communities at a very reasonable price. In this way poor communities could also benefit directly from conservation and there would be less animosity towards protected areas. At a trophy fee of \$20,000 per elephant the accrued income would be two million dollars; with 100 hunters hunting for a seven day safari each at \$200 per day an additional \$140,000 would flow in and the meat sales from 100 elephant at \$2.00 per kilo would generate another \$400,000. Makes a total of 2.54 million dollars, or \$25,400 per hunter. This again translates into a daily revenue per hunter of \$3,628 (equals Rand 23,582).

The average ecotourist would not generally spend more than 1,250 Rand per day. To generate the same amount of income, one would need just about 20 ecotourists for every hunter!

The significantly higher environmental impact of the ecotourist as compared to the hunter becomes quite plain to see when the figures of the following table are extrapolated over a year.

	20 Ecotourists	1 Hunter
Sewage generated/day	20 kg	1kg
Water requirement/day @ 100 liters/person	2000 liters	100 liters
Supplies per day/person @ 3 kilos	60 kg	3 kg
Transport requirements	5 vehicles	1 vehicle

Ecotourism creates much more sewage and waste, needs much more water and leads to higher traffic volumes. More traffic brings elevated sound and emission pollution and the spotlights from the game drive vehicles at night are reminiscent of London during the *Blitz*.

A tourist lodge is a large semi permanent to permanent structure that will deface natural habitat for a long time. A tented hunt-

ing camp can be moved and will leave behind very little long lasting impact. Tourist lodges – almost without exception – require electricity which has to be carried by power lines criss-crossing and defacing the environment. A tented hunting camp, much like a wilderness trail camp, can happily get by on paraffin or gas lighting.

Logic clearly indicates that allocating a hunting quota of animals which would have to be culled anyway makes good ecological and yes (perish the thought) financial sense. It would be wise for Park officials to administrate and run such hunting operations themselves and not put it out to tender for private outfitters. Allowing private outfitters a foot in the door would open the door to corruption and related malpractices. National Parks would appear to have learned a lesson in this regards. A number of years ago, SANParks decided to put one of the most successful ventures on record, wilderness trails, out to tender for private operators. The concession period is soon to expire and reports I have heard indicate that SANParks would like to take wilderness trails back under its wing. Wise move!

Bold decisions have to be made in the interest of long term conservation. Assigning hunting quotas from animals that might have to be culled makes ecological and financial sense, but sometimes people allow emotions to overrule good sense.

As conservationists we take no delight in having to consider and sometimes implement culling as a wildlife management option. Unfortunately we are faced with the reality of an ever increasing human population and declining space for wildlife which has to be fenced into ever smaller enclosures. It does not require a high IQ to understand that the habitat of fenced game populations has a carrying capacity limit. When this threshold is exceeded game populations have to be reduced. If wildlife managers are prevented to implement sound management by politicians or well meaning but naive animal rights pressure groups, what remaining wild land there is, will itself be destroyed.

Whether in the long term we, as South African wildlife managers, will have the freedom to make choices based on scientific/ecological principles remains open. International politics will in all likelihood have the final say. If you don't believe me, have a look at an extract from a report recently submitted by TRAFFIC to the South African Government on the hunting industry in South Africa via the Panel of Experts on Hunting: "The actions of organizations and governments outside of South Africa have the potential to impact both negatively and positively on the hunting industry. In 1999, TRAFFIC East & Southern Africa was subcontracted by the US Agency for international Development (USAID) ..." (*Editor's note: the full text can be downloaded on http://www.environment.gov.za/HotIssues/2005/29062005/07October/PoE_research_report_Status_quo_of_hunting_industry_2st_draft.doc*)

What is the association between USAID and TRAFFIC? The words "actions and governments OUTSIDE of South Africa potentially impact ..." have an ominous ring to them. Do we make our own conservation decisions? I think not! Not the way we were able to do so in the past. Watch the press as the culling debate unfolds and you will see what I mean.

Perhaps the readers have now a more balanced perspective with regards to the issues and should make a point of sharing their knowledge with others.

A version of this article was previously printed in *Game & Hunt*, Vol12/4 (2006).

3 Game Rangers Association of Africa: Position on Hunting in South African Protected Areas

This statement was prepared by members of the Executive Committee of the GRAA and was circulated to its members for comment. While the majority of members support the contents of this statement, there are some who may not be in complete agreement, and the statement may thus not represent the opinions of all GRAA members. (The text has been shortened by the editor of African Indaba)

There is more wildlife on private land in South Africa today than there was before wildlife became an economically viable form of land use. In areas that are not suitable for non-consumptive tourism, the hunting industry has created the basis for many livestock production units to convert to extensive wildlife production. Hunting is both a revenue-earner and a tool to support conservation management objectives. The societal, economical and environmental gains that this industry has created merits support and protection.

In the African Indaba eNewsletter and elsewhere there has been an increased level of lobbying for hunting inside protected areas in South Africa. Opposition to these views has come from various quarters, including the SA Hunters' and Game Conservation Association (SAJWV) who published an official statement totally rejecting hunting in national parks. SAJWV also mentioned that only about 0.5% of South Africans are hunters and that the parks system belongs to all people. In their official statement SAJWV cited, inter alia, ecological impacts of hunting in national parks and ethical considerations as reasons why they can not endorse the proposed hunting in national parks.

The Panel [of Experts on Hunting] emphasized that the system of national and provincial parks in South Africa accords the highest level of conservation to areas of unique biodiversity significance. These parks are mostly on publicly owned land, although the Protected Areas Act does provide for the incorporation of privately owned land into such parks on a contractual basis. The national and provincial parks systems are vitally important for biodiversity conservation and they also provide a unique experience for the persons visiting them. There is "sense of place" and an experience of nature that should be protected in these areas.

In principle the GRAA supports the recommendation of the Panel (on which the Professional Hunters Association of South Africa was represented) that commercial hunting practices should be prohibited on publicly owned land in national and provincial parks - this includes special nature reserves, national parks and nature reserves as per the Protected Areas Act definitions. However, commercial hunting has already been allowed in some publicly owned protected areas in South Africa for some time, such as in former Bophutatswana (apartheid era independent state) national parks which are now managed by the relevant Provincial protected area agency.

In recognition of the important role that hunting plays in these areas, the GRAA therefore recommends that the principle

should be applied that there should not be hunting in protected areas except in those that were/are originally established with hunting as one of their primary founding objectives.

In determining a hunting policy for South Africa it is fitting to compare and consider the policies in other African countries. Tanzania is Africa's leading hunting destination. In that country a clear distinction is made between Game Reserves (i.e. Selous), where hunting is allowed, and National Parks (i.e. Serengeti), where hunting is prohibited. In Kenya, hunting is not allowed in any public protected area. In Namibia hunting is recognized as a legitimate land use that makes an important contribution to the economy - it creates jobs and funds the management of areas that are not suitable for non-consumptive tourism - but hunting is also not allowed in national parks. In the case of South Africa where hunting is allowed in certain protected areas, perhaps a clear distinction should be made between these parks and other protected areas, as is the case in Tanzania?

The GRAA supports the views of the Panel which acknowledges that there is a need to manage population numbers in protected areas and recommends that where culling is required it should be undertaken by the public authority in charge and not made available on concession. Furthermore, that where contractual parks have been established with private landowners and community, or where fences between private land and national and provincial parks have been removed, limited forms of hunting can be allowed on that private land, subject to the agreement of the conservation authority in charge of the park, the establishment of a proper management plan, and scientifically based off-take. Similar arrangements should apply to hunting in protected environments outside of the parks system.

4 News from Africa

Angola

The illegal ivory trade has doubled over the last 12 to 18 months, according to a WWF/TRAFFIC report. Over 1.5 tons of worked ivory products, representing the tusks of at least 300 African elephants, were observed during the June 2005 survey. To support elephant conservation, CITES Parties adopted an action plan to shut down Africa's unregulated ivory markets at the 13th CoP in October 2004. However, of the 37 countries that still harbor wild populations of African Elephants, Angola is the only one that remains a non-Party to CITES and is, in fact, the only nation in sub-Saharan Africa to remain outside of the Convention.

Botswana

Richard Root (68), a professor at the University of Washington Medical School who moved to Botswana to help alleviate a shortage of doctors there, was killed when a crocodile dragged him from a canoe, whilst on a wildlife tour of the Limpopo River in remote north-eastern Botswana. Root taught at Penn in the early 1970s before moving on to Yale and then, in 1982, to Seattle. He was in a lead canoe with the tour guides when the crocodile rose out of the water and grabbed him. He was not seen again. The tour guides were wary of hippos, but there had been no reports of crocodile attacks in the area.

Continued on Page 6

5 PHASA Presence at Major US Hunting Shows

Courtesy: [PHASA](#)

Safari Club International

The support PHASA received from [SCI](#) was tremendous. Not only did SCI make a \$3000 donation to the PHASA Conservation and Empowerment Fund, they also auctioned the PHASA hunt at the Friday night banquet. The outfitters who were chosen for the hunt by way of a draw, were Phillip Bronkhorst and Abie Steyn. The hunt fetched \$10,000 of which \$9,000 goes into the PHASA fund. This effort is a significant gesture by SCI, PHASA and our members in showing government back home that as an industry, we are committed to transformation. We hope that this hunt package will become an annual item on the SCI evening auction and that PHASA builds it up both in value and prestige, perhaps with support too from government in way of some animals from their reserves!

Dallas Safari Club

Once again [Dallas Safari Club](#) welcomed PHASA as VIP guests. DSC continues to support PHASA on all fronts. PHASA approves all SA outfitters on the DSC show and Dallas Safari Club in turn limits the number of donated hunts offered at auction. The DSC convention has grown tremendously in size in recent years and draws visitors from the area and surrounding states. The number of PHASA members exhibiting was the same as previous years. Dallas Safari Club supported the PHASA Conservation and Empowerment Fund with a \$5,000 donation. PHASA is extremely grateful for all the support received from DSC and from Gray Thornton, their CEO, in particular.

Houston Safari Club

Held at the Woodlands about 40 minutes north of downtown Houston this show was also their biggest yet. The [Houston Safari Club](#) Show was oversubscribed by PHASA members. Houston Safari Club also cooperates with PHASA to regulate who gets booths on the HSC show.

6 Dieter Ochsenein Receives SCI McElroy Award

By Gerhard R Damm

"Named for SCI's founder and chairman emeritus, the C.J. McElroy Award honors a hunting industry person of the world's community who has made great contributions to the sport of hunting, achieved excellence in worldwide hunting, displayed a dedication to the conservation of wildlife, and has a history of service to the global hunting community and to Safari Club International's goals. Potential nominees must have shown exemplary ethics in business and be committed to SCI's programs."

During the 2006 Convention in Reno the C J McElroy Award Committee of [Safari Club International](#) selected Dieter Ochsenein of South Africa as 11th recipient. Dieter is the first person from Africa to be honored with the McElroy Buffalo.

A long-standing live member and avid supporter of SCI, Di-

eter did not miss the SCI Annual Hunters' Convention for almost two decades. Since the inception of the SCI Special Hunters' Award Program for physically disabled hunters, now named the SCI Pathfinder Award, Dieter Ochsenein was amongst the program's most generous supporters.

In 1997 Lance Norris selected Dieter for the "SCI President's Award". According to Lance, the main award criteria were his expert advice in hunting and conservation matters and especially his singular dedication in the yearlong struggle to obtain the release of hundreds of confiscated trophies from over fifty hunters held by the Tanzanian Authorities because of financial irregularities committed by a safari operator during the season. Thanks to Dieter's efforts, these hunters not only got their trophies, but also saved considerable additional expenses. From 2000 to 2005 Dieter served as SCI International Director and was subsequently appointed Honorary Director.

The PHASA Executive Committee would not have been complete without Dieter – almost fifteen years until 2005 he volunteered sound advice and ample time to the professional hunting industry and he served as the Association's president in 2003 and 2004. PHASA presented Dieter with the "Wildlife Utilization Award" for his dedication.

Dieter Ochsenein was and is an untiring proponent of Fair Chase and ethical hunting and his African hunting achievements were recognized by the South African Hunting & Conservation Association with the Musgrave Award in 2003 – an honor reserved for only the most distinguished South African hunters of African game. Dieter's museum-like trophy room bears witness to his adventurous exploits in Botswana, Zimbabwe, Benin, Tanzania, Kenya, Central African Republic, South Africa and the Republic of Congo with many outstanding trophies.

More than a decade ago, Dieter got bitten by the "mountain-hunt-bug"; the only remedies for this serious disease are constant trips to the world's most remote mountain ranges and a continuous quest for the elusive *Ovis* and *Capra* species. His trophy room shows proof of these exploits, with wild sheep and ibex from the remotest regions of Asia and North America. Dieter's quest for the North American Grand Slam for Wild Sheep is still ongoing and will keep his body and mind fit.

Dieter Ochsenein's hunting career started in his native Switzerland at the tender age of eight. It was the yearning for safari adventures which brought him and his wife Erika to African shores – and their plans of returning to Europe after a year or two were quickly scuttled as soon as they had drunk from African waters. After a stint in the engineering business, Dieter seized an opportunity when Highveld Taxidermists came up for sale in 1984. Last not least, taxidermy was his long standing hobby and he was already quite proficient in the art. His astute business acumen and singular dedication soon turned the derelict taxidermy company which he took over into a premier enterprise. His clients come from all corners of the world – not only hunters, also a number of museums have selected Dieter's intimate knowledge of the African animals to create truly lifelike representations.

Now, after more than 20 years, Dieter, his wife Erika and their son Thomas have transformed Highveld Taxidermists into one of the leading taxidermy enterprises of the world. Dieter and his family live near Pretoria in a picturesque bushveld setting.

Continued from Page 4
4 News from Africa

Botswana

Conservation biologist Cheryl-Samantha Owen has conducted research into the sustainability of elephant trophy hunting in Botswana. The results suggest that the current level of trophy hunting of mature bulls is sustainable and unlikely to threaten future availability of trophy sized tusk. She also writes "that in terms of numbers, the population could support double the current hunting pressure, although within two decades the supply of larger trophy animals would dry up. However, given that on average only 68% of the hunting quota is used, it is highly unlikely that an increased quota will ever be fully utilized". African Indaba has information about the 2005 elephant hunting results of one of the largest outfitters in Botswana. This company hunted 59 elephant bulls during the 2005 season and the average tusk weight was 63 pounds.

Ethiopia

A senior expert in Ethiopia's Wildlife Conservation Department stated that the Ethiopian red fox may be wiped out unless it is protected from domestic animals bringing rabies into national parks. He said there are fewer than 500 red or simien foxes left, most of them found in Bale Mountains National Park and over the past two months five out of a population of 200 red foxes had died in the park, suspected of being infected with rabies from dogs accompanying livestock to the area.

Mozambique

Over a period of 18 months, between 2001 and 2002, lions killed 70 people in Cabo Delgado province. Most of these were people out at night protecting their crops from elephant. Crocs are responsible for most deaths. Many croc deaths are not reported, simply because of the logistics involved for many people in getting to a government office. A rough estimate would be around 300 people a year nationwide. In 2004 thirty people were taken in the Mutarara district on the north bank of the Zambezi. Probably a similar number were killed on the south bank.

Mozambique

There were a number of elephant shot on problem animal control with tusk weights of over 40 lbs a side and a couple over 70 lbs a side. This could be interpreted that the illegal hunting that has taken place has not been so heavy that it has depressed the average tusk weight.

Namibia

A study by the University of Namibia found that sections of the Etosha National Park fence along the northern border are deteriorating; those sections bordering the Omusati Region were in the worst condition. Lion, hyena, elephant and jackal wandering out with lion the major problem animals in the Oshana Region, while hyenas and jackals cause problems in Oshikoto.

Namibia

An analysis of Human Wildlife Conflict (HWC) in the country has found that between 2001 and 2004, there was a marked increase in incidents of conflict between humans and wildlife. Now MET will look into measures that will mitigate the impact. The Caprivi region records an annual loss of about N\$5.6 million to GDP. Caprivi, according to Dr Flip Stander, by far outweighs all the other regions regarding conflict frequency. A draft National Policy on Human-Wildlife Conflict Management Policy will look into the economic impact of HWC on communities, identify an appropriate level of decision making for managing the prob-

lem, prevent conflict and minimize the damage and also develop stakeholder skills to manage HWC efficiently and effectively.

Namibia

By the time this African Indaba reaches your computer, the Namibian authorities should have finalized the auction of the big game concessions; for more than two years the global hunting community waited for this. It is said that hunting is about to commence as early as August 2006 and you can look forward for some very interesting packages.

Kenya

A report commissioned by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and published during a scientific seminar on avian influenza in Nairobi in April says that intensive poultry operations along migratory wild bird routes are incompatible with protecting the health of ecosystems that birds depend upon. They also increase the risks of transfer of pathogens between migrating birds and domestic fowl. The report focuses on the environmental factors underpinning the re-emergence of old diseases and which are likely to be triggering the rise of new ones like highly virulent avian influenza or H5N1. The report concludes that current "heroic efforts" focusing on "isolation, quarantine, culls and medications" are likely to be quick fixes offering limited short term benefits and recommends that governments, the United Nations and public health experts back environmental measures like massive restoration of wetlands in order to counter the spread of H5N1. Restoring tens of thousands of lost and degraded wetlands could go a long way towards reducing the threat of avian flu pandemics by dispersing wild birds away from domestic ones.

Kenya

Kenya Wildlife Conservation and Management Network co-ordinator, Wilson Mwang'ombe, said the management of the Tsavo East and West National Parks by local authorities would enable the locals to benefit from wildlife resources. The proposal was made at a Mombasa hotel during a workshop sponsored by ActionAid, which focused on inequality in Kenya. The State should withdraw the Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS) from manag-

Continued on Page 14

African Indaba eNewsletter

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

WEB: <http://www.africanindaba.co.za/>

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 would like to remind you that archived copies of African Indaba eNewsletter are available from our website.

Subscription requests, comments or article submissions should be sent to: gerhard@muskwa.co.za please include your name, full address, e-mail address and organization

7 Rebuilding the Wildlife Sector in Zimbabwe (Part 1)

A pre-feasibility study with action proposals for donors and NGOs

By Dr. Rolf D. Baldus and Dr. Graham Child

Introductory Note: It is with great concern that we have observed the wanton destruction of wildlife and wildlife areas in Zimbabwe over the last decade. However, we are positive that the present political nightmare will come to an end and that the people of Zimbabwe will be allowed to rebuild their country. It should not be forgotten which important role wildlife has played in the economy of the country and the potential wildlife can have again in the future. "[People and Wildlife e.V.](#)", a small German pro-wildlife NGO, has commissioned a study which should assist donors from the international, Governmental and private sectors to identify the potential and plan future assistance for the reconstruction of the wildlife sector. The study was written by Graham Child, now a consultant, and formerly Director of the Department of National Parks and Wildlife Management in Zimbabwe, and Rolf D. Baldus, a German economist with many years experience in wildlife management in Africa. Both have written the paper in their personal and private capacity only.

African Indaba publishes this document in three parts starting with this issue.

1. Executive Summary

A decade ago Zimbabwe was one of the leading countries in wildlife conservation and management. The sector earned over US\$ 300 million per year through conservation generated by protected areas belonging to the state, rural community run wildlife management areas and private game ranches and reserves. Sadly most of this has been destroyed or severely damaged within a few years of political lawlessness and corruption led by the Mugabe regime.

Wildlife however, has a great ability to recover within a relatively short period of time, provided the natural habitats remain intact, sound protection and wise management can be reintroduced. The formerly thriving wildlife sector can be restored, but to achieve this, a newly established democracy will need the assistance of bilateral and international donors and "hands-on" conservation NGOs.

The future political decision-makers of Zimbabwe as well as donor institutions must not overlook the conservation and sustainable use of wildlife once a new start is possible. Reconstruction of Zimbabwe will certainly draw substantial international support. Wildlife conservation is not a luxury that may be taken up at a later stage after the most urgent tasks of rehabilitation have been achieved. Zimbabwe's wildlife heritage is the draw card of the country's tourist industry, which is a sector that can quickly be turned around and play an important role in the reconstruction of the country.

For the recovery of the wildlife sector, it must be incorporated in economic development and poverty reduction strategies from the start of the reconstruction effort. Many tracts of land formerly devoted to wildlife are now occupied or resettled. Appropriate action is needed fast or the remaining wildlife in these areas will be lost forever. Past experience shows that these areas are un-

suitable to conventional agriculture, and that wildlife production is the most appropriate form of land use. It is therefore sensible to restore the wildlife populations for the benefit of community-based and/or private management regimes. As is shown, these wildlife-based land use systems mutually benefit one another and are not exclusive.

Furthermore, the sustainable use of wildlife is in line with the Convention on Biodiversity and the ruling principles of the World Conservation Union (IUCN), of which Zimbabwe is a member.

This paper takes a firm stand of zero cooperation with the current Government of Zimbabwe, which is responsible for country's current state of affairs. It is intended as a pre-feasibility study from where a future democratic Government and interested donors may initiate their own more detailed planning. Also, this paper is not a detailed analysis of that current state of affairs. Instead, the authors put forward a range of ideas, but not project proposals in the fields of:

- Wildlife policy, organizational and administrative reform
- Rehabilitation of the estate, capacity building and strengthening of the field force
- Community based natural resources management (CBNRM) locally referred to as CAMPFIRE
- Private commercial game ranches and conservancies.

2. Introduction

Zimbabwe had a proud record in the field of wildlife conservation and had developed an economically and ecologically sustainable wildlife sector by the early 1990s. The country had contributed significantly to southern Africa's pre-eminence in the conservation of wildlife and its habitats and had achieved strong private sector growth. Areas supporting wildlife increased rapidly in support of a significant and diversified wildlife industry guided by free market principles within a progressive institutional framework. The CAMPFIRE programme was one of the first institutionalised systems of community based wildlife conservation and use in Africa.

From being a world leader in the wildlife field Zimbabwe has been reduced to a non-entity in the last five years. The impressive progress the country once had was nullified by inept and corrupt administration, coupled with politically motivated lawlessness. In the case of the lucrative wildlife industry the resource base was squandered through wanton poaching and habitat degradation in which the Party and Government officials entrusted with the stewardship of the resources were often prominent.

Halting and reversing this trend will be a massive undertaking, but one well justified by the ability of African wildlife to maximise long-term rural production on a broad front, especially in disadvantaged areas unsuited to sustainable agriculture. It will require a focused programme to salvage the Parks and Wildlife Estate and allow the resource outside to resume contributing, as it should, to long-term human well-being and the alleviation of rural poverty. This paper suggests a prioritised holistic approach to rehabilitating the wildlife sector in Zimbabwe as soon as possible after the inevitable political change. Urgency in mounting such a programme is stressed because significant political change can be expected to result in a period of confusion as a new order establishes. Past experience shows that such peri-

Continued on Page 8

Continued from Page 7

7 Rebuilding the Wildlife Sector in Zimbabwe

ods are fraught with both dangers to and opportunities for the proper management of fugitive resources like wildlife. It is proposed that donors include wildlife conservation into their assistance programme when Zimbabwe's reconstruction becomes an international task. This would contribute to biodiversity preservation as well as poverty reduction through sustainable wildlife use. Planning for such projects should start now.

3. Past Achievements of the Wildlife Sector In Zimbabwe

3.1 From 1960 to 1990

Until 1960 wildlife was in serious decline in Zimbabwe but the pattern was common in much of Africa. Colonial legislation focused responsibility for managing wildlife in top-down bureaucracies, denied its inherent economic value and prevented people on the land from managing it in conjunction with the rest of the ecosystems of which it was a part. As a result, decision makers overlooked its value, from politicians and civil servants to landholders who decided its fate on the ground. Population numbers and wildlife habitats declined through overt action to eliminate a worthless competitor for the benefit of agriculture or simply from benign neglect.

The decline in the wildlife resources of the country were halted and reversed with the introduction of the Wildlife Conservation Act (1960). Inauguration of the Act heralded a period of 15 years of adaptive institutional reform. Landholders were allowed greater discretion over the management of wildlife on their land and could market its products with increasing freedom. Landholders were encouraged to maximise their profits from using wildlife sustainably. Benefits from the resource and accountability for conserving it were brought close together where they could interact positively and serve as a positive incentive for landholders in whom authority over the management of wildlife was now centred.

Institutional frameworks immediately halted and reversed the downward trend in large wild mammal populations. Furthermore, with the institutional framework in place, wildlife was able to benefit from the declining terms of trade for ubiquitous agricultural commodities that commenced in the mid 1970s. Farmers who had complained that they could not "farm in a zoo" now accepted that they could not farm sustainably and profitably "outside the zoo". In switching to wildlife alone or in combination with livestock they demonstrated the economic importance of having conserved the biological diversity inherent in a spectrum of large indigenous mammals and their habitats.

Confidence gained and lessons learned by the institutional reform process were consolidated and extended in the Parks and Wildlife Act, 1975 that replaced it. This Act recognised National Parks and five other classes of ecological reserve and provided for the better management of the reserves and wildlife, including fish, outside their borders. Landholders were allowed considerable freedom in the management and marketing of the wildlife and its derivatives from their land, without Government abrogating its responsibility for ensuring the proper conservation and use of the resource. Discriminatory implicit taxation, such as through the imposition of government hunting licence fees, and high transaction costs through an unreasonable requirement for permits, were effectively abolished. Instead, landholders including the State on State Land were encouraged to maximise the

benefits earned by the resource within the limits of the land use policy for each property.

Within a decade, land with significant wildlife exceeded 30% of the country, with that in the private and communal agricultural sectors exceeding the area of the Parks and Wildlife Estate. A financially important industry dominated by recreational hunting and tourism and their ancillary services had grown up around the two, and the private sector was demonstrating improved environmentally friendly land use. Socio-economically sound institutional development had been integrated with ecologically sustainable resource management towards creating a self-supporting and holistic conservation programme.

CAMPFIRE grew from the confidence in wildlife, as a productive, profitable and competitive land use, that had been tested on commercial land. The two sectors remained mutually beneficial with communal farmers benefiting from the scales of operation, marketing strategies, examples, and standards provided by commercial game producers. They in turn benefited from the complementary range of trophy animals available on Communal Land. Piggybacking wildlife use in Communal Areas on that in Commercial Areas was largely responsible for making the former viable and able to help counter land degradation and mitigate the resulting poverty vortex, even where the resource was limited. CAMPFIRE's biggest shortcoming was that benefits did not reach directly to the communities, but were channelled through secondary bodies at District level.

3.2 Destruction of a Thriving Sector of the Economy

Profitable game ranching increased often to the exclusion of other forms of agriculture on commercial farms and ranches and the internationally renowned CAMPFIRE programme grew and flourished in the communal areas, despite covert Government opposition. On commercial land, wildlife was seen as a ruse to evade taxes, while on communal land it was resented because it was a powerful democratising force eroding central authority over the people. Success in both cases depended on individual landholder families benefiting directly in financial terms from having wildlife on their land. Use of wildlife in the two land classes remained highly complementary and its strength in the face of growing political adversity confirmed the soundness of the approaches to conservation that they embodied.

The wildlife sector became the fourth major strut in the national economy and continued to grow until the early 1990s when political circumstances caused it to falter. New appointments with limited competence and hence confidence began to curtail the liberalisation that had led to the growth of the sector, because they saw it as a threat to their power base. Ordinary landholders paid a high price for this political patronage and the incompetence and corruption it nurtured.

The strength of the wildlife sector based on commercial and communal land and the Parks and Wildlife Estate showed considerable resilience in the face of the abnormal politically motivated challenges. This occurred despite considerable discrimination in favour of incompetent and corrupt party supporters in the award of concessions and other permissions, and in the appointment of officials. It was not until the countrywide politically sponsored lawlessness accompanying the redistribution of land that the wildlife sector succumbed.

The land redistribution exercise encouraged widespread

Continued on Page 10

8 Pierre van der Walt's International Big Bore Cartridge Load Data Collection

Reviewed by: Kenneth Richardson

This 168 glossy page, A-4 (210mm x 297mm), full color, coffee table quality paperback could just as well have been called the *International Hunter's Manual of African Big Bore Cartridges*. This is not a book filled with anecdotes in the Pondoro Taylor fashion. It is a definitive reference manual par excellence, which provides the reader with the history, plus an abundance of technical and dimensional specifications, application ranges, performance thresholds, sighting and the reloading principles and tricks of 31 of the most loved African big game cartridges. The incredibly extensive information is beautifully conveyed by means of a logical, flowing writing style. 106 full color photos and 150 tables prompted former game warden, David Sutherland, now director of Sutherland Hunting Academy to state: 'You will spend thousands of Rands on other reference books and still not have the information concentrated in this one publication.'

Starting with the 9,3x62mm Mauser and ending with the .585 Nyati, the book offers more than 1,700 loads for all popular international propellants brands – including South African Somchem propellants. It is a publication written to be a useful, everyday companion to every international hunter, irrespective of whether he is American, Scandinavian, African or Australian, professional or amateur. It is a book that will settle virtually all campfire arguments because it is factual – not emotional. You do not find references to cartridges that penetrate seven eland and a tree in this one. But it offers even more than just fantastic specific cartridge information. It contains the most sensible Propellant Burning Rate Chart I have seen, as developed by the author over a period of 20 years. This is augmented by a short, easy-to-understand thesis on solid bullet terminal performance and instability which opened my eyes. It introduces readers to the concepts of Green- and Amber bands of cartridge application on African big game; something I have never seen in a book before, but which should have been published decades ago.

It is therefore not surprising that the PHASA Chairman commented on the back cover: 'A world class reference work for every hunter, collector and big bore enthusiast ... worthy of PHASA's full endorsement. I would strongly recommend that every serious big game hunter ... get himself a copy.'

Although it is a reference work, it is something you can pick up and read from cover to cover with a bit of perseverance - but it was clearly not intended to be used that way. Even so it tempts one to at least read up on every cartridge incorporated over a short period of time

Like all other books this one is not perfect. I would have liked to have seen even more cartridges included even if I understand the cost considerations. I miss the .425 Westley Richards, the .376 Steyr, the .450 No.2 and the .476 Westley Richards. The odd grammatical or spelling error that slipped through the net is there, but hard to find and not bothersome at all.

I also hope that this publication will one day make it to hard cover as it deserves such treatment. Like PHASA's chairman, I unreservedly recommend *International Big Bore Cartridge Load*

Data Collection to every serious hunter, reloader or collector. It is the most informative book on big bore cartridges I have ever read.

International Big Bore Cartridge Load Data Collection retails for R 270-00 (US\$ 43.78) plus shipping and it is worth every cent and more. It is published by Zimbi Books, Pretoria, South Africa. Tel & Fax: +27-12-3462326. E-mail: zimbi@mweb.co.za. For more information visit Zimbi's website www.zimbibooks.com

9 Achim Steiner Nominated New UNEP Chief

UN News Service

Achim Steiner, the head of the world's largest environmental network, was today nominated by Secretary-General Kofi Annan to be the next Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), succeeding Klaus Toepfer on 15 June. Mr. Steiner, a German national who is expected to be elected to a 4-year term by the General Assembly, is the Director-General of the World Conservation Union (IUCN) which has over 1,000 members in 140 countries.

"He has worked both at grassroots level and at the highest levels of international policy-making to address the connections between environmental sustainability, social equity, and economic development," a spokesman for Mr. Annan said.

Prior to his assumption of the directorship of the Conservation Union in 2001, Mr. Steiner served as head of the World Commission on Dams and as Senior Policy Advisor of IUCN's Global Policy Unit, where he developed partnerships between the environmental community, the World Bank and the UN system.

During Mr Toepfer's tenure, the Program was restructured into 5 priority areas: environmental assessment and early warning, development of policy instruments, enhanced coordination with environmental conventions, technology transfer and support to Africa. Mr. Toepfer has also been instrumental in integrating environmental concerns and economic development.

"Positioning the Game Industry for Competitive Advantage"

This will be the theme of a game management conference at the Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University Conference Centre (North Campus), Port Elizabeth on 4 & 5 September 2006. The target audience is game ranchers, tertiary institutions, organizations affiliated to game ranching and Government Departments related to the industry. A number of high profile speakers have been invited to speak at the conference. African Indaba will inform you about details once the list of speakers and topics has been finalized. In the meantime the organizers have issued a [Call for Abstracts](#) for consideration and inclusion into the program. Abstracts must be presented in the prescribed form before May 26th.

Please support [Bishops Lodge](#), the main sponsor of the African Indaba Website during your stay in Port Elizabeth.

Continued from Page 7

7 Rebuilding the Wildlife Sector in Zimbabwe

poaching, which extended to the military and the Parks Authority itself. Law enforcement agencies often refused to take action against it, on the spurious pretext that the offences were a political act and thus outside their jurisdiction. Objective data as to the extent of the countrywide poaching is difficult to assemble, but knowledgeable observers believe 60 to 80% of the wildlife outside the Parks and Wildlife Estate has been slaughtered, with the situation in some parts of the country worse than in others. Additionally, there has been serious poaching in the Estate and the Party paid destitute people to destroy habitats on many farms through the wanton felling of woodland and its destruction with fire. It is of little surprise that the tourism and to a lesser extent recreational hunting previously supported by wildlife has been greatly depressed.

In the absence of reliable economic data it is impossible to determine the extent of this collapse or the loss to the national economy that it represents. Both are, however, considerable. Some recreational hunting has continued as international hunters are less prone to being put off from visiting a trouble torn country than are ordinary tourists, but generally both sub-sectors of the tourism industry are in a depressed state. Many private sector ventures have closed down, patronage of others is minimal, and many highly qualified Professional Hunters, Guides and other essential staff have emigrated in the massive brain drain that is afflicting Zimbabwe and depriving it of skills and people with the right attitude towards tourism in all its forms. There is reliable information that many hunting blocks have been taken over by political cronies of the party and government and that they exploit these areas in cooperation with unscrupulous operators and professional hunters unsustainably.

The good news is that wildlife has a remarkable ability to recover in a relatively short time provided some protection is reintroduced and the habitat has not been lost. It will be possible to reverse the present trends in the industry provided law and order is brought back and the sector receives the necessary support.

4. The Task Ahead

Rebuilding the wildlife and tourism sector in Zimbabwe following political change will be a considerable undertaking. It will present both opportunities and challenges and will be difficult without carefully directed and prioritised external assistance to recreate an effective system suited to local Zimbabwean conditions. These conditions are changing all the time so that a new management system should seek to combine considerable appropriate past experience with new innovative measures to accommodate the future.

Urgency is important as a measure of confusion is bound to occur during the political transition, especially as the new hierarchy will probably lack experience in managing wild resources at the national level. This period will be one of opportunities and risks for wildlife. Opportunities will arise because the new government is likely to have an open mind on many day-to-day actions before its position with respect to particular issues becomes entrenched. At the same time there is a risk that if there is a vacuum of indecision, unscrupulous elements, many of which are already in position, will continue to abuse the resource and will entrench themselves. Radical realistic action is needed quickly to halt abuses and set the direction for an effective and efficient phased recovery of the wildlife industry, based on sound

socio-economic and ecological principles acceptable in the country and to the new government.

The aim must be to halt and root out corruption and simultaneously to replace it with action to promote recovery of the resource and the industry it supports. This should commence with a review of policy and the setting and prioritising of goals within a realistic time frame; apportioning accountability to recognisable individuals and organisations to achieve measurable objectives; and allowing those responsible to act within a policy agreed by the new Minister. This is bound to be influenced by the nature of future land tenure and in particular the extent to which a new government will reinstate the former pre-eminence of commercial agriculture. The revival of wildlife production outside the Estate will then depend on:

- The resuscitation of game ranching on suitable large properties;
- The combination of these properties into conservancies with shared wildlife populations wherever possible, and the creation of integration groups of large and small scale producers wherever practicable; The strengthening and up grading of the CAMPFIRE programme in communal areas which a recent US Aid survey (early 2003) showed had weathered the recent land upheaval remarkably well;
- The extension of the CAMPFIRE concepts to land set aside for resettlement, where there is presently a free for all among settlers who are abusing the wildlife as a free resource due to the absence of suitable institutions to guide the conservation and use of the shared fugitive resource;
- Encouragement of the private sector infrastructure in support of these land holders. This will range from strengthening the CAMPFIRE Association, and re-establishing a Game Producers' and other associations relevant to the wildlife industry. It will extend from supplying affordable seed stock of animals to repopulate denuded properties to encouraging rejuvenation and future growth of commercial safari and tour operators, lodge keepers, and the many other commercial enterprises that combine to service the industry based on wildlife.

The resulting action program should be flexible, opportunistic, and sensitive to the independent variables that are bound to emerge as it is implemented. It is not possible, at this stage, to predict the opportunities that will arise as the result of future land tenure and other political changes. The availability of skills to exploit the various options is also not known as many potentially valuable skills that emerged during the growth of the industry have left the country. Because of this lack of information and the many variables likely to impact on the revived wildlife sector, this initial strategy for action omits detail and concentrates on the general form that the action should take, stressing important priorities. It must concentrate in the wildlife sector on a few priority areas, the following in particular:

1. Wildlife policy and reorganization of the wildlife administration
2. Rehabilitation of the public protected areas
3. Bring CAMPFIRE back to life and improve it
4. Encourage the commercial wildlife sector

A number of ideas for actions to be taken in those fields after change to a majority rule government committed to democratic

Continued on Page 11

Continued from Page 10

7 Rebuilding the Wildlife Sector in Zimbabwe

representation, the rule of law, good governance and economic reconstruction will follow in the second and third part of this paper.

Abbreviations

CAMPFIRE – Communal Areas Management Programme for Indigenous Resources, CBNRM – Community Based Natural Resources Management, CEO – Chief Executive Officer, DNP – Department of National Parks and Wildlife Management, NPA – National Park and Wildlife Management Authority, IUCN – World Conservation Union

The authors

Dr Graham Child was the Director of the Department of National Parks and Wildlife Management in Zimbabwe from 1971 to 1986. He has been an independent wildlife consultant since retirement and has a wide international experience in all aspects of wildlife and protected area management

Dr. Rolf D. Baldus has worked for 13 years in wildlife management, CBNRM and the rehabilitation of degraded protected areas in Eastern Africa. In Zimbabwe he was responsible for planning a donor funded wildlife project in the early nineties (www.wildlife-baldus.com)

"People and Wildlife" e.V. is a registered NGO and charity in Germany. Its objective is to foster community based wildlife conservation in Africa.

Disclaimer

The paper reflects the personal opinion of the authors only and not necessarily the views of institutions they work for. We thank a number of persons who have received and commented on earlier drafts, without bearing any responsibility for the content.

(End of part 1 – to be continued in the next issue)

10 Nguni Cattle on a Game Farm

By Gary van den Berg

This document is not a *scientific report* but a personal account of observations made over the past 18 months. When we purchase Bushfellows Game Farm in 1999, we were aware that we were buying in a "hartwater" area and that ticks were problematic.

The property is typical Bushveld with a few areas of Sicklebush encroachment. We deliberately elected not to have Buffalo and Rhino since our kids were young and wanted to explore the property. As we stocked the ranch with game, we ensured the status of new animals by manually checking them in the trucks and then as a back up, spraying them with a registered tick remedy. In large scale game translocations, some animals will die of capture myopathy within the first 2 weeks. Those that we were lucky enough to find in their last minutes were covered with ticks. It is common knowledge that animals that are stressed become an easy target for ticks.

We began observing the Eland from the hides and they were inundated with ticks in their ears and udders. The Giraffe had

numerous ticks between their legs. A Sable cow that was limping was darted and whilst treating her, we observed literally hundreds of ticks in her mane, belly and between her legs and udder. There were no Oxpeckers and hardly any Cattle Egrets as natural tick control on Bushfellows.

The obvious next step was to install varying forms of tick sprays/wipes. We purchased Tick Off pressure sprays and Duncan Applicators. The Tick Off units were installed in kraals, with salt and licks as the attraction. The Duncan applicators were grouped about 20m apart near a waterhole that the Eland frequented, once again salt and licks were used as the attraction. Whenever possible we used licks that had Ivomec included and in winter used Aloe supplement as well. We changed the Tick product every 3 months to avoid any immunity problems. So began our war on ticks.

Costly apparatus, using costly liquid and requiring continual servicing and maintenance. And we still had ticks. The Eland still suffered. We still found 40 to 50 ticks on hunted animals. We had to find a "natural" solution but it just was not happening, so for nearly 5 years we battled away and we gained ground. In the bad winter in 2003 he ticks were back with vengeance, however.

Wildlife ranching has the unfortunate legacy of having many "specialists", tons of theory but very little practical hands-on information. It's only when you've had a problem that others who had or have similar experiences come forward with possible solutions.

Our solution came quite by chance. In 2004 I read an article on Nguni Cattle. They are part and parcel of our African landscape. Nguni are fairly drought resistant and are a protein source. At that time I was also involved in finding solutions for the Wildlife Industry to embrace BEE and help rural communities get involved in wildlife ranching. Combining the needs of wildlife and the aspirations of rural Africans with traditional African pastoral knowledge is a necessity in this context. Did Nguni cattle offer a solution to our problems?

Ngunis do not stand and graze but move continually, thus not pressurizing any specific areas. Daily, they tend to cover at least 5km. Literature states that they consume less water than commercial cattle. They usually drink and settle near a waterhole in the evening. We continued our research, looked and asked, but only got negative responses: it just is not done! The next problem was client perception – Bushfellows is a Game Lodge; clients pay for a "bush experience", they are not paying to go on a round up. There were other immediate challenges: Wildebeest and commercial cattle with *Snotsiekte* and managing domestic livestock and game – very real problems. All these issues and needs would have to be managed and learnt about.

Eventually we took the plunge and purchased our Nguni - ten cows and one bull! We decided to give them to our son and daughter as their entry into "investing", at the time of writing the 10 +1 had become 27, not a bad return. As I mentioned this is not a scientific document, so anyone with similar experience or advice is welcome to submit their findings. These are ours:

When the herd arrived, they had been de-wormed and we sprayed them with TickOff, not wanting any new strain of tick and let them go. Free, back to nature. They took it seriously; they were gone in no time!

Nguni become wild if left to fend for themselves, they are

Continued on Page 12

Continued from Page 11

10 Nguni Cattle on a Game Farm

very protective over their calves. Within 6 months they had settled and began to also accept humans in closer proximity. Every cow has given birth to a calf each year. A solid 100% productivity, with some cows allowing the previous calf to continue suckling as well. One cow was caught in a poacher's snare, the wire had cut very deep into her throat, the cut was at least 60cm long. We monitored her daily in the bush, she lost some condition but within 2 weeks the wound was fully scabbed; she had a calf 3 months later. Without any medical intervention!

Our guests at the Lodge find the "Nguni Story" very interesting and the cattle have become a conversation topic and are therefore well photographed. They are each quite unique. Our Nguni maintain their condition and look exceptional, even at the end of winter, although we refrained from any human intervention or additional feeding. We have observed this adaptive breed browsing as well as grazing thus utilizing a broad spectrum of available fodder.

The Ngunis mix and graze with our wildebeest. Although we had augmented our wildebeest herd with new stock we have not experienced any *snotsiekte* or related problems. Another observation was the calming effect the Nguni cattle had on game, especially the quite skittish Eland.

Tanned Nguni hides have a good niche market; the animals are therefore not just beef on the hoof. Letting them fend for their daily forage without supplements, additional feeding and medication also made the resulting beef as *organic* as it could be – adding additional value.

Back to our tick problem. In the early days, the Nguni were covered with ticks and eventually the air force arrived. First we observed the occasional Egret, and then more and more, until they moved in permanently. Next came the Oxpeckers. We only have about 20 Oxpeckers today, but we are busy setting up nesting sites and hopefully they will breed rapidly. Now we often observe the Oxpeckers cleaning the Wildebeest, Eland and Giraffe and there are always a few Egrets around. Even the Dung beetles have increased dramatically in number. The natural balance seems to be back in place.

We have cut back on the pressure sprays but still maintain the Duncan applicators. The acid test came when we hunted the game. Over the last few months we have found less than 5 ticks on any hunted animal. A natural solution or at least part solution seems to have been found, which has no adverse impact on the surroundings.

But it does not end there, another potential benefit, which we will begin monitoring this summer is the reseeding of grasses. The cattle have dropped dung in many of the sandy, barren areas. It will be interesting to see if palatable grasses now seed in those areas.

I have no doubt in looking at our model, that rural farmers and wildlife ranchers need to be made aware of the benefits of endemic cattle, as they certainly can outperform commercial imports in the wild and can help achieve sustainable protein plus balance the eco-system.

Some Background Information on Nguni Cattle

Nguni cattle are a sub-type of the African Sanga cattle associated with the pastoralist cattle culture of the Negro/Bantu people of Africa. Protein analyses indicate that they have characteristics of both *Bos taurus* and *Bos indicus*. Physiologically they

have characteristics that place them apart from both types. What is certain is that they have been shaped by natural selection in the African environment for thousands of years.

The ancestors of the present day Nguni of South Africa were brought into the country by the southward migration of the Khoi people from the central lakes area of Africa. These cattle are still found wherever the descendants of the original groups of the Nguni tribe settled, namely Swaziland, Zululand and Mozambique, between 600 and 700 AD. Since then, these animals have played an important social and economic role in the development of these societies. The amount of animals held by a village or individual determined much of their importance to the rest of the world. King Shaka of the Zulus understood this cultural and economic importance and seized the control of the Nguni herds on his dominions. Shaka also bred the Ngunis according to color patterns in order to produce skins for the several regiments of his army. His elite personal guard was recognized by pure white, from animals of the royal herd, the *inyonikay-iphumuli*.

Besides the several color patterns, Nguni cattle also present a variety of horn shapes. All different combinations were catalogued in the beginning of the century by a South African headmaster. This work inspired the Nguni Cattle Register, a compilation of terms to describe purebred Nguni. Apart from the area where the Nguni occur naturally there are some 140 registered breeders owning 1,400 registered cattle.

The Nguni was originally, and indeed still is, a draft animal. Under sound management conditions it is becoming increasingly popular as a beef breed. The areas where Nguni cattle occur are climatically the most harsh and disease-ridden tracts of Africa. These areas are prone to droughts and other realities that Mother Nature can throw at us from time to time.

Nguni cattle have the following qualities, characteristics and traits:

1. They are not large cattle with bulls weighing 500-700kg (~1100-1550 lbs.) and cows weighing 320-440kg (~700-975 lbs.). Calves wean at approximately 175kg (~385 lbs.) and grow at 0.70 kg (~1.55 lbs) per day until weaning.
2. The bulls have well developed rounded cervico-thoracic humps which are muscular rather than fatty. The cows have small almost non-existent humps.
3. The cattle are heat and light tolerant and have thick pigmented skins covered with fine short hair of different mixtures of color (Black, white, red, brown, cream and dun).
4. They have long productive lives. Cows will produce 10 or more calves calving regularly. The cows show great efficiency and often wean calves that weigh 45-50% of their body mass.
5. Nguni cattle are less prone to dystocia, this being ascribed to their sloping rumps, small uterus and low birth mass.
6. They develop excellent resistance to ticks and immunity to tick borne diseases. Disease incidence and mortality are low.
7. They are excellent foragers and will graze and browse on steep slopes and in thick bush alike.
8. Finished carcasses dress out at roughly 180-220 kg (~400-500 lbs). Marbling is good with a thin covering of fat.
9. Nguni fatten well on natural grazing as well as in the feedlot.

Continued on Page 13

Continued from Page 12
10 Nguni Cattle on a Game Farm

The historical development of the Nguni has resulted in a breed with good temperament and mothering ability.

Undoubtedly the Nguni form part of our modern heritage and require more research. New Zealand are presently doing research on feral merino, as it is clear that natural selection has allowed specific strains to survive, where the present day animal requires various remedies to do so. There is a twofold benefit to be derived, cheaper production cost and from the consumer's point of view, less chemical manipulation of their protein.

For further details on Nguni cattle please go to: www.tropentag.de/2004/abstracts/full/326.pdf#search='ngunicattle' and read the paper "Going Backwards, Moving Forwards – Nguni Cattle in KZN" by Wolfgang Bayer et al.

11 Kenya: The Example Not to Follow

By Ian Parker

For multiple reasons, over the past 110 years or so, Kenya has had more influence on international conservation policy than any other African country. Among them are openness of terrain, visibility of abundant animals, temperate climate, the British aristocracy, Hollywood and Hemingway. At least until 1910 the sale of ivory and income from sport hunters accounted for more than half the country's income and Kenya was probably the world's first country where sustained wildlife-based tourism played a really significant part in its economy.

Recreational hunting was the principal form of tourism from 1890 until the early 1960s, after which "motorized game viewing x package tourism" displaced it. In the 1970s the Kenya Game Department and its successor - the Wildlife Conservation & Management Department (WCMD) - became so corrupted that in 1977 all hunting was banned. Few realize that the cause of the ban was not recreational hunting, but hunting in all its forms, including problem animal control and commercial cropping through which the Department ran a massive trade. Be that as it may, the industry that set up Africa's wildlife based tourism and had been sustained for over seven decades was closed down. From that point on, Kenya became an example of what not to do.

While the primary reasons for stopping hunting were administrative and political, they were understandably welcomed by the anti-hunting fraternity. Kenya was the world's first country to totally ban hunting (except for game birds) and as such is the jewel in the anti-use crown. The hunting ban was initially intended to be temporary - a point Government repeatedly stated and of which evidence exists in both files and media archives. The anti-hunting parties made the translation of temporary to permanent a major priority.

The solution to corruption in WCMD was to have sacked all who were corrupt. Stopping hunting went nowhere near the root of the problem. Corruption fostered incompetence and inefficiency which, in turn, ensured WCMD (1975 to 1989) and its successor, the Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS, 1989 to present)

would be perennially bankrupt and 'influenceable' by anyone prepared to spend money on it. And this is what the animal rights-ists have done. It suited them to have a corrupt, centralized and autocratic body responsible for wildlife because it was simple to control.

With its dependence on 'help', KWS seems to think it must dance to tunes played by the animal rights pipers. This has effectively blocked investment in sustainable use of wild animals - other than for viewing over which KWS can exercise no control. Such sustainable use as was briefly allowed, understandably, involved little investment. No one wanted to put money into developing a resource whose use was controlled by KWS. More seriously, reluctance to countenance hunting has aggravated human/wild animal conflict that costs the country a huge amount annually. Many Members of Parliament from wildlife districts doubt the value of wild animals and some openly advocate getting rid of them. Proof of the incompetence pudding is that in numbers Kenya's larger wild mammals have declined by over 60% since the ban on legal hunting was introduced.

What has been ignored is that where a demand exists for something that is not obtainable legally, it will be obtained illegally. That is the situation regarding Kenya's consumption of 'bushmeat'. While there may be no legitimate hunting, there is a vast amount of illegal hunting. I do not say that creating a legitimate trade in game meat would stop the illegitimate business, at least not in the short term. Much of the investment and the livelihoods involved in the illegal trade can not simply be switched off. Both have a momentum of their own that guarantees whatever changes might take place will be gradual. There are documented cases (trout, salmon, ostriches, crocodiles, deer et al) where legitimate production makes illegitimate production unprofitable. Yet where Kenya is concerned, the extreme situation brought about by animal rights movements may be beyond practical recovery. The nursery rhyme about Humpty Dumpty gives the message.

This unsatisfactory situation led the veteran MP, the Hon GG Kariuki, to introduce a Private Member's Bill in June 2004 to amend the Wildlife Act. His basic thrusts were (1) to mandate that landowners who benefited from wild animals had to assume some liability for damage those wild animals did to others, (2) introduce an elected element onto the KWS Board of Trustees and (3) introduce effective elected advisory councils at district levels to advise the Trustees on local policy.

While most of the Bill's supporters approve of sustainable use, the Bill was not devised to reintroduce hunting. It's far more fundamental aims were to make the governance of Kenya's conservation system democratic and controlled by those who live with wild animals - the land owners, regardless of whether they are private or communal. That was the political objective. And it sought to redress the conflict between wild animals and farmers: a situation in Kenya that has no parallel in southern Africa. Once these goals were attained, issues such as hunting, controlling the bush meat trade, etc. would all be addressed on their merits, primarily by people elected to do so and who were not beholden to aliens or donors of whatever stripe.

Making KWS responsible to electors through democratic process would have removed it from animal rights NGOs' control. This is why they opposed the GG Kariuki Bill - not in open

Continued on Page 14

Continued from Page 13

11 Kenya: The Example Not To Follow

debate - but through fronts and from behind the scenes. This did not wash with the parliamentarians and, after going through all the prescribed steps, the Bill was passed with acclamation by MPs from across the floor of the House. It was then sent on to the President for assent which he refused in January 2005.

The President refused to give his assent, apparently taking the advice of individuals connected to the animal rights lobby, as well as from the Acting Minister for Wildlife & Tourism, the Hon. R Tuju. The latter advanced the animal rights lobby argument that the Bill was merely a stalking horse to re-introduce hunting to Kenya. The Bill, however, was about governance and compensation and those NGOs lobbying against it, including the International Fund for Animal Welfare were rightly afraid that this would loosen their hold over the Kenya Wildlife Service. That it might subsequently change policies regarding consumptive use of wildlife is indeed possible, but by no means a foregone conclusion.

What next in Kenya? A minor piece of legislation widely supported in Parliament has now acquired a political weight out of all proportion to its content. The manner in which it was blocked challenged the Parliamentary process - with animal rightists openly crowing "we are powerful enough to override your Parliament ... the President listens to us!" This has added immeasurably to a growing hostility towards NGOs overall - of which over 1,500 are registered in Kenya. The activities of some certainly compromise Kenya's sovereignty and are patently neo-colonial. I cannot see this interference being tolerated indefinitely and predict that when action is taken to curb alien NGO influences, many healthy babies will go out with the bath water! Meanwhile, Kenya stays on track as a useful example to other countries of what not to do.

For nigh on three decades and over much of the country, wild animals are a problem which it makes good sense to be rid of. Talk of them being a useful resource, to coin a Kiswahili phrase, "*ni hewa tu!*"

First Published in "*Sustainable*" - The newsletter of the IUCN SSC Sustainable Use Specialist Group: July 2005

From a letter by Basie Maartens, past president of PHASA, on Canned Shooting

Game Ranching flourished in South Africa and has saved many species. But there are boundaries within one must operate. When game ranching and breeding becomes a money-making racket, all the morality has gone out of it, when a "client" shoots a canned animal he is a shooter, not a hunter. It is not a matter of whether it is legal or not, it is a matter of morality.

The ultimate challenge we as hunters face is to create a culture of hunting, respect for the animal and a spirituality which takes us to a higher level than a mere trophy on the wall or venison on the table. This culture must be our philosophy, it must be written in our hearts and not on slates of stone which can be broken.

The word hunting has so many meanings - is it a wonderful concept or a destructive pursuit? An inborn instinct in man and beast, or an acquired taste for self aggrandizement? If we find the right answer then we can truly say that hunting is a necessity, not a luxury, that hunting is conservation in its purest form.

Continued from Page 6

4 News from Africa

ing the two parks, and give the local councils the authority to run them. He recalled that during the Kanu regime the locals were promised that they would get 25% of the park revenue and later President Mwai Kibaki promised that 10% would go to the local authorities, but nothing happened so far.

South Africa

Benkoe Lions, a company based in Coligny/South Africa, claims in an advertisement in African Sporting Gazette that it is "*rated as one of the largest lion breeding projects in South Africa*" and invites readers to a so-called "*Conservation Protected Hunt*" (whatever they mean with this expression remains obscure). A quick check at their website reveals that Benkoe is obviously a canned shooting operation offering a photo catalogue of lions at prices according to sex, mane and age. Certainly it is not hunting what they offer - and it is not conservation what they practise. Might have something to do with making money, though!

South Africa

The Department of Environmental Affairs & Tourism (DEAT) will publish the draft hunting regulations on May 2nd for public comment. Interested parties should check the [DEAT](#) website on or after this date and submit comment.

South Africa

A Black Economic Empowerment (BEE) Scorecard Task Team has been established for the hunting industry of South Africa. On this team are [PHASA](#) President Stewart Dorrington, Gary van den Berg, Executive Committee Member of Wildlife Ranching South Africa ([WRSA](#)), Lorraine Kretzschmar from the Taxidermists Association of South Africa ([TASA](#)), Constant Hoogkamer from the Nature Conservation Department in the North West Province and Dr Pieter Botha from the national Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism (DEAT).

Zimbabwe

Wayne Dietrehsen has been caught in possession of an irregularly issued PH license with the number 472. The license has been confiscated by National Parks investigators and Dietrehsen has been informed he may not hunt lion, elephant, hippo or buffalo. The case was further complicated with Jacob Mudenda writing to the [Hunting Report](#) in January saying "*on 21st December 2005 I, in my capacity as the National Chairman of the Safari Operators Association of Zimbabwe - which is an amalgamation of Zimbabwe Indigenous Safari Operators (ZISOA) and Zimbabwe Association Of Tour & Safari Operators (ZATSO), personally went to the National Parks and Wildlife Authority Headquarters in Harare to confirm if [sic] Mr Dietrehsen was issued with a Professional Hunter's License. That was confirmed. His Professional Hunter's license is Number 472. I have also personally examined the said license and am satisfied that it is a full license without any restrictions at all.*"

At a meeting between National Parks and the Safari Industry on 2nd of March the withdrawal of Dietrehsen's fraudulently obtained license has been confirmed and Mudenda was asked to explain his actions. (The Zimbabwean PH master list can be obtained from fishunt@zol.co.zw.)

12 Hunting Benefits Biodiversity

Rolf Baldus Interviews Tim Caro, Professor, Dept. of Wildlife, Fish and Conservation Biology University of California

The interview conducted by Dr. Rolf D. Baldus discusses the effects of legal hunting on wildlife management. Prof. Caro has researched biodiversity in Tanzania for a quarter of a century. He was an outspoken critic of all kinds of hunting when he started. Meanwhile his picture is more differentiated. Has he turned from *Paulus* into *Saulus* (to use the turnaround of the warrior *Saulus*' conversion in the New Testament)?

Baldus: *You have researched wildlife biology and management issues in Tanzania for 25 years. In the year 1985 you published an article in SWARA, the East African Wildlife Society magazine that was highly critical of biological arguments used by tourist hunters in East Africa and elsewhere. Since then you have continued your research. Any new findings or still anti-hunting?*

Caro: My views on tourist hunting have changed a lot since 1985. At that time I focused on one aspect of hunting, namely the effect that removing animals can have on a population. For example, in my Swara article, I discussed how big game hunters like to shoot the biggest males. New behavioral and ecological research studies at that time were showing that these large males were not old animals that would soon die, as hunters had claimed, but were likely to be the breeding males in the population. Similarly new studies in the 1980s were showing that when an adult male lion that belongs to a pride is removed, new male lions come in and kill young cubs in order to bring the females back into heat quicker. So shooting territorial male lions has the effect of killing a generation of cubs as well.

Hunters still have these effects on animal populations, of course, but they also have an important positive influence on habitat conservation and this is where I have been focusing my attention over the last 5 years. What I mean by this is that large areas of land, especially in Tanzania, have been set aside expressly for the purpose of tourist hunting, and in so doing, they have stopped people moving into these areas to cultivate and graze.

So if you look at the big picture, conserving the numerous species that live in an area - plants, fungi, insects, birds, reptiles etc - does it really matter if hunters reduce the lion population or the eland population to very low levels? Probably not, so if you direct your attention to many species, or biodiversity as it is now called, hunters have a very positive effect because the money that they bring into the country makes it economically worthwhile for the government to protect an area.

The other thing that has made me more sympathetic to tourist hunting, other than a change of personal focus, is that I now believe that it has a trivial effect on mammal and bird populations compared to illegal hunting. The illegal hunting takes two forms in Tanzania: hunting by residents who have obtained permits to shoot a few animals but who take many more than they are allowed, and hunting by people who have no permits at all. I don't think anyone really knows exactly how much is taken illegally but huge numbers of animals are involved each year, far, far more than that taken by tourist hunters.

Baldus: *Could you please specify the positive effects which*

hunting tourism has on habitat conservation?

Caro: Big game hunting has an important role in preserving large areas of land from agriculture and settlement in Tanzania and elsewhere. The Government has set aside large areas of land as Game Reserves, over 100,000 km² in total, which allow for limited tourist hunting. The money generated from this type of hunting through licenses and fees is used as a justification for keeping people out of these areas since the money can be used by the Government to build roads or hospitals etc. My research group at the University of California at Davis has shown that Game Reserves are beneficial for both mammals and vegetation.

Using aerial census data collected by the Conservation Information Centre in Arusha, we were able to compare the density of about 20 species of large mammals in National Parks, Game Reserves, Game Controlled Areas and Open Areas across the country. We found that densities of most species were similar in Game Reserves and in National Parks despite certain species being shot by tourist hunters which shows that Game Reserves are good at protecting mammal species.

Both types of area contained much higher densities of mammals than Game Controlled Areas or Open Areas that also sanction tourist hunting but that allow settlement and cattle grazing and resident hunting as well. This shows that it is not tourist hunting itself that conserves mammals but it is the absence of people living in Game Reserves and National Parks or perhaps the absence of resident hunters that are the key.

We also looked at the health of vegetation in different types of protected area using satellite imagery. When we divided up pixels in Tanzania according to whether they were in National Parks, Game Reserves, Forest Reserves, Game Controlled areas or Open Areas, we found that National Parks and Game Reserves showed increases in greenness during the 1980 and 1990s. Thus Game Reserves set aside for hunting blocks help to keep habitats healthy as do National Parks. Game Controlled Areas and Forest Reserves on the other hand suffered great habitat degradation perhaps because they were having trees removed from them during this period of time. Once again, this research shows that excluding certain activities, such as tree cutting or resident hunting, or excluding people from areas is the key to conserving habitats.

In short, if tourist hunting is accompanied by laws, which forbid other activities, and if these laws are enforced, as they are in Game Reserves, then legal hunting benefits animal and plant communities. When activities are allowed and when there is no policing, as in Game Controlled Areas due to lack of funds, then tourist hunting does not help conservation.

Baldus: *This brings me to your earlier point. You say the effects of legal hunting on wildlife can virtually be disregarded as compared to illegal hunting. Can you elaborate on this? And does legal hunting and the financial returns from it have any effect on the illegal activities?*

Caro: Each year animals are killed by people both legally and illegally in Tanzania. Legal hunting is carried out by residents and tourists who obtain licenses to shoot a small number of animals, as well as in cropping schemes. Illegal hunting is carried out by people who have no permits at all, but also by tourists and residents who have obtained permits to shoot a few animals

Continued on Page 16

Continued from Page 15

12 Hunting Benefits Biodiversity

but who take more than they are allowed.

Let's go through these one by one bearing in mind that there is little information on how many animals are killed by illegal methods. First, a hunter may kill an animal having acquired licenses. While such hunting is legal, the quotas allocated for legal hunting are based on educated guesswork because we do not have adequate information on the size of most animal populations in the country.

Thus owners of a hunting block may be allocated a quota to shoot too many individual animals – say too many lions in a given year. In practice, the Wildlife Department usually sets quotas based on what the quota was last year. In an attempt to help the Wildlife Department come up with more informed quotas, we matched the population sizes of animals counted from aerial surveys with the tourist hunting off-take in different parts of the country and found that off-take was usually low - normally less than 10% of the population size – so the Wildlife Department has got it just about right. Nevertheless, certain species such as eland, lion, leopard and antelope such as reedbeek were being killed at overly high rates in some areas.

Hunting licenses for residents are allocated by Regional and District Game Officers. They face the same problem as their head office in Dar es Salaam they don't know the number of animals in areas under their jurisdiction. These officials usually set quotas according to what they were last year as well - but no one knows whether these are biologically correct. Near towns these quotas are on the high side because Game Officers are "under siege" for licenses from many applicants rather than just one hunting company. In short, official hunting quotas at the Regional and District levels may not be set at the appropriate level to maintain animal populations in the long term. This problem could be solved by regular monitoring of wildlife populations right across the country. It might be feasible but very expensive. Unfortunately, there is a second problem with legal hunting. This is the problem of stretching the quota. There are many ways that this is done. For example, a hunting company can call up the Wildlife Department and say that they don't have a quota to hunt leopard this year in this area, but they have a client who would love to shoot one, so could head office stretch a point and sell them a license for just one animal? Another way this is done is if the hunting company has a license to shoot a leopard in one of its blocks in the west of the country, but it uses that license to shoot a leopard in its eastern block. Yet another way is when a resident asks a Game Officer if he could take two hartebeest instead of one because Christmas is coming up.

A third problem with legal hunting is that residents or tourists may take more animals than their quota allows. Consider a tourist hunter who shoots a male buffalo with fair-sized horns but on the last day of his safari, finds a much larger male. Since he is a rich foreigner and the Game Scout with him earns a low salary, he can easily make it worthwhile for the scout to forget about the first buffalo.

Of course the extent to which this happens is not known as tourist hunting companies rarely admit to it. Resident hunters also do the same thing. With a license to hunt one eland, they may shoot say two or three. Or, if they are unable to locate an eland, will shoot say four reedbeek instead. The extra meat or money can be given to the Game Scout to keep him quiet. These last two problems could be solved by tightening up on current practices

among Wildlife Department field staff, and this will probably occur in time - although it may not occur quick enough to save wildlife outside Game Reserves.

Despite these problems with legal hunting, I am sure that most wildlife in Tanzania is actually killed by people who have no license at all. Usually these are villagers who set snares or go out with dogs or with a muzzle loader and kill whatever they encounter. Some of this meat is cooked at home but an increasing amount is sold in town markets or exported to the city where demand for game meat is high. Over the last year, demand for bushmeat has increased greatly because people's standard of living is on the increase. In most of the many villages in Tanzania there are several poachers; as a result this kind of hunting probably has the biggest effect on wildlife in the country.

In theory, this problem could be solved with tighter policing by National Park Rangers, Game Scouts and police officers, and heavy fines set in court. But given the number of poachers and the high demand for bush meat, these forces are overstretched already. Another possibility is to initiate police and military operations that remove guns from people's houses. This has been done before in Tanzania and works well for a few years. Yet another possibility is to get local people involved in conserving game species that live around their villages but there are few of these "community based conservation schemes" and we still don't know whether they will prove successful in the long term.

On a more positive side, the revenue generated by tourist hunting makes it worthwhile for the Government to keep areas set aside for wildlife protection, Game Reserves, and to pay Game Scouts to monitor hunters' activities. It is therefore important that money from tourist hunting is channeled directly back into Reserves. Also, during the dry season when tourist hunters are visiting, their presence may deter poachers, although poachers move back in the wet season.

In short, the revenue generated by tourist hunting has a very positive impact for habitat conservation; however, resident and tourist hunting are associated with many semi-legal activities that have negative impacts on wildlife populations. Nevertheless, by far the greatest threat to wildlife is from local people hunting outside the law. Without doubt these are the neediest of citizens and this presents managers and conservationists with a real headache, one that they have been unable to solve.

First published in "Miombo", the magazine of the [Wildlife Conservation Society of Tanzania](#), January 2006

Our Shared Kingdom at Risk: Human-Lion Relationships in the 21st Century by Laly Laing-Lichtenfeld, Yale University

Laly Lichtenfeld's 2005 dissertation focuses on a multi-disciplinary study of human-lion relationships in the Tarangire ecosystem in Tanzania; she explores the complex web of attitudes among the local Maasai, professional hunting and photographic tourism communities toward lion by researching psychological, political, socio-cultural, economic and ecological factors. Her conclusions highlight the positive and negative effects of each stakeholder on lions and lion conservation.

Download the complete paper from the African Indaba website by clicking [HERE](#)

13 The Legally Structured Role of Hunting and Fishing in the US and Abroad

By John J. Jackson, III

Introductory note by the author: *The subject of "animal law" includes animal rights. Animal law is part of American law school curriculum. A number of state bar associations have established "animal law" committees or sections and the American Bar Association has formed an Animal Law Section. There are "animal law" courses at Yale, Harvard, University of Washington School of Law, etc. These schools also have separate "animal rights" courses in the curriculum. Inevitably, animal rights, cruelty and humane concerns are more likely to be discussed in "animal law" courses in law schools than in animal law section programs of state bar associations. Likewise, livestock, farm animals, dangerous animals and pets are the most common topics before state bar association sections.*

For that reason, I accepted an invitation to make a presentation before the Texas Bar Association's 5th Annual Animal Law Program (April 2005). Two speakers were true animal rights lawyers from Washington State and Michigan, and the others were somewhere in between in philosophy. My own presentation served giving the audience a better appreciation of the indispensable role of hunters and hunting. Most of the lawyers in the audience didn't know and appreciate the importance of hunters and anglers. The faces in the audience reflected surprise that hunters and anglers pay more for non-game as well as biodiversity than all others in society combined.

My presentation is not about livestock, farm animals or pets, it's about the conservation and management of our wildlife and wild places. I am here to help complete the full spectrum of animal law issues.

In the 20th century America's wildlife system became the envy of the world. Commonly called the *North American Wildlife Model*, it is a user pay system primarily funded by legally required hunting and fishing license fees, excise taxes on manufacturers of firearms, ammunition, archery equipment and motor boat fuel taxes. The licensing and taxing of hunters and anglers provides an *indispensable* \$3.8 billion dollars per year in revenue to fund approximately 75% of state wildlife conservation budgets. The system has been the "backbone" of America's wildlife management and habitat success. It has restored America's 230,000 Wild Sheep, 1 million Black Bear, 1 million Pronghorn, 1.2 million Moose, 1.2 million Rocky Mountain Elk, 6.4 million Wild Turkey, 36 million Whitetail Deer and up to 105 million Waterfowl. It has also paid for the largest share of conservation of *non-game* species. Consequently, hunters and anglers have contributed *more for wild non-game* species than all others in society combined and continue to do so today.

This government management infrastructure is reinforced by sportsmen NGOs that have no equal such as Ducks Unlimited, the Foundation for North American Wild Sheep, Wild Turkey Federation, etc. America's hunters and anglers pay for the law enforcement. They pay for the research. They pay for the management. They pay for the habitat. There are an estimated 147 million different hunters and anglers that lawfully hunt and/or fish

every 3 years in the U.S. They are the givers, not the takers.

This user-pay system is the wildlife conservation paradigm and the status quo in North America. It has been the primary force for more than one hundred years. It may be useful to compare this user-pay, sustainable use system with other legal wildlife regimes. The benefits of this system are easily contrasted with those such as in some South American or African countries where all hunting is illegal under those legal regimes in principle all is protected. There are no revenues from hunting so there is little revenue for law enforcement beyond the borders of limited protected areas, less research, less management infrastructure, less management and fewer habitats. The wildlife is used anyway, but that use is not harnessed to serve, conserve and to protect. The wildlife is poached. The potential resource of hunting and fishing is not harnessed by the legal system to provide revenue and conservation incentives or to build and maintain a wildlife management infrastructure. That system proves that if you leave your house empty, thieves will move in.

The popularity of big game hunting in America has grown at an incredible rate over the past 50 years. Basically, it has tracked the rebounding growth in big game animal populations. Big game hunting has never been more popular. Those hunters and fisherman have spilled over into foreign countries. Many of the conservation managers in developing nations have been trained in the USA. They have learned to use licensed, regulated tourist hunting to conserve wildlife and biodiversity. Unlike resident hunting here in the U.S.A., tourist hunting is much higher in revenue, and lower in volume with even lower biological impact.

Tourist hunting and fishing now provide the revenue means of local and national management authorities and the local and national incentives for wildlife and habitat conservation abroad. The various legal strategies are purposefully designed to use hunting for conservation or to provide conservation through hunting. **Game species are hunted to conserve them.**

The role that sustainable use can have in conservation has been recognized and adopted as policy in the Resolutions of IUCN's *Second* and *Third World Congresses*. It's embodied in the provisions of the Convention on Biodiversity (CBD), including the CBD and CITES adoption of the *Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines of Sustainable Use*. CITES recognizes the special

Continued on Page 18

Hunters as Pro-Active Citizens

Go public – Whether it be talking with a reporter or chatting with your neighbor, take every opportunity that comes your way to share your hunting experiences and your conservation knowledge.

If we only communicate with other hunters without making a concerted effort to reaching the public, we are preaching to the choir.

Continually cultivate and seek out ways to explain the conservation relevance of hunting to non-hunters and that incentive-driven-conservation of biodiversity benefits all.

Always strive for personal excellence whilst in the field and hunting; enhance by your individual action the survival of wildlife populations, the protection of biodiversity, and the promotion of sustainable use of nature.

Continued from Page

13 The Legally Structured Role of Hunting & Fishing in the US and Abroad

role that recreational hunting and fishing can play by giving such practices favored treatment. CITES prohibits all commercial trade of species listed on Appendix I, but not hunting and fishing trophies. Trophies personal use have been expressly favored as early as at COP2 and at COP9 further unnecessary impediments to the export and import of hunting trophies of Appendix I listed species were removed. CITES also requests importing countries to accept the export countries' hunting trophies and related biological and management decisions.

The required "non-detriment" determinations for trade in hunting trophies of Appendix I species still have to be made by exporting and importing countries, but that too has been facilitated by the development of *quotas* set by the CITES Parties. The first such quota for leopard permitted tourist hunters to bring their trophies home. Leopard that would inevitably have been shot, poisoned or snared became trophies and hence one of the building blocks of conservation infrastructure. The quota favored the limited, licensed, regulated tourist hunting of leopard turned that species from a liability into an asset that paid for its conservation and the conservation of other species.

Similar quotas have been established by the Parties with the underlying recognition of the benefits that can arise from the sustainable use of game species. Like the Nile Crocodile, Cheetah, Markhor, White Rhino and Elephant Hunting trophy quotas have been accepted and set when the population of the affected species have been less than 2,000 as in the case of the Markhor in Pakistan's Targhor region. Such quotas have had remarkably positive conservation consequences. The licensed, regulated trophy hunting of White Rhino has generated millions of dollars. When the hunting began there were less than 2,000 white rhino in existence. The white rhino population has now grown more than seven fold. The revenue from the tourist hunting has provided the means to save the rhino and the motive as well. **White Rhino have been hunted to conserve them.** The management regime has been strategically designed to conserve wildlife through its use.

Now the critically endangered Black Rhino has reached the population level of a few thousand as the White Rhino had decades ago. At the COP 13, the 167 Parties to CITES adopted a trophy hunting quota for Black Rhino. Quotas of 5 for Namibia and 5 for the Republic of South Africa were established. As a game animal, that rhino species has an edge on its own survival, a highly regulated second chance. The quota is intended to capitalize on that contemporary conservation strategy. It remains to be seen if the Black Rhino can benefit from tourist hunting as the White Rhino and other species have. Why? Unlike the White Rhino, the Black Rhino is listed on the US Endangered Species list as "endangered," not just CITES Appendix I.

The USF&WS has had regulatory authority to permit importation of ESA "endangered species" from the inception of the Act, but has had a practice not to grant such permit applications. The Service's practice has been contrary to the American conservation experience and directly conflicts with modern sustainable use principles. It's been a diplomatic insult to developing nations and has obstructed those country's earnest efforts to use licensed, regulated, limited hunting where it can do the greatest good. In the past, the Service has permitted the import of trophies of "endangered" Bontebok taken in South Africa's pro-

grams on the basis they were captive bred and the hunting activity "enhanced" the survival of the population in the wild. That, in fact, has provided the necessary revenue for game farmers to maintain their Bontebok populations and the incentive to positively produce them.

The USF&WS has also permitted the taking of ESA listed "endangered" exotic species in Texas when a share of the revenue has been directed back to the species' country of origin to enhance the species recovery or restoration in the wild. As a practical husbandry and management necessity, surplus animals have to be controlled. Those permitted hunters from the U.S. do indeed provide the primary conservation revenue in India, Laos, Cambodia and other distant countries for endangered species such as Barasingha, Eld's Deer and Arabian Oryx. Hunting those listed species in Texas is funding most of those species conservation. That is another statutory and regulatory success arising from wise use.

The USF&WS has noticed a proposed change in practice to permit importation of trophies of game species listed as "endangered" in the *Draft Policy for Enhancement of Survival Permits for Foreign Species Listed under the Endangered Species Act* in 2003. The purpose is to give those game species the advantage they should enjoy as game species but only in very select cases where the range nation has a comprehensive program that is dependent upon trophy hunting and the hunting is a net benefit to the species' survival or restoration. If fully put into practice, this will allow the American hunting community (both hunters and their conservation organizations) to show once again what sustainable use can do. The very possibility has already been the driving force underlying the conservation advances of species like the Black Rhino. Unfortunately, to this date, the Service's permitting practices have denied foreign game species listed as "endangered" their greatest hope of survival.

In summary, hunting and fishing are more than important recreational activities. Hunting and fishing programs have been crafted and designed to propagate game and non-game species. Whether abundant or endangered, smartly crafted programs can serve and save our wildlife around the world.

This essay (shortened) is reproduced with the kind permission of "Conservation Force". For detailed information go to www.conservationforce.org or contact Conservation Force by email cf@conservationforce.org.

Conservation without Borders

Society for Conservation Biology

20th Annual Meeting in San Jose California 24-28 June 2006

A primary objective of the 2006 meeting of the Society for Conservation Biology is to transcend real and perceived boundaries of ecology, sociology, politics, and human behavior that impede conservation science and its application. By leveraging the intellectual capital of professionals and students with diverse expertise and affiliations, we aim to build conservation capacity at local, regional, and global levels. Major topic areas will range from partnerships with private landowners to marine and freshwater conservation to transboundary conservation.

For registration and fees please check:

www.conbio.org/2006/Registration_fees.cfm

14 Falconry, a Southern African Heritage in the Making

By Dr A.P.F. Lombard

Near the centre of Zimbabwe, close to the town of Masvingo, exists a sprawling ruined city built of dressed but un-mortared granite stones, known as "Great Zimbabwe"; its purpose and origins lost in the mists of time. It was in the Site Museum of these ruins that I found, several years ago, a metal object identified as an Arab Falconry Bell. I have been unable to trace the provenance of this object but it is fascinating to speculate that, at some time in the distant past, a falconer visited this city where he left, lost or gave away a bell, thus leaving tantalizing evidence of his presence. If this were the case, many centuries would pass before falconry was again practiced in the region.

In September 2005, I was privileged to attend a conference in Abu Dhabi, to present falconry as an "Intangible World Heritage Activity" to the Director of Cultural Heritage of UNESCO. The purpose of my invitation was to present *The Falconry Heritage of Southern Africa*. This appeared a somewhat daunting task as I would stand before nations that have a falconry history which stretches back over thousands of years and state my case. This caused me to examine the history and practice of falconry in Southern Africa and I came to the realization that we do have a falconry heritage which we should value and cherish.

Falconry is integral to the heritage of diverse peoples inhabiting Asia, the Middle East and Europe, where it has been practiced for hundreds, if not thousands of years. Falconry was not practiced in Southern Africa, within recorded history, until immediately before the Second World War. At this time, falconry was enjoying the start of a renaissance in Western Europe. It was settlers from this region who imported it to Southern Africa. I have identified three distinct "generations" of falconers in the Southern African context:

The First Generation spans the years 1945 to 1965. These were the first falconers who brought knowledge of falconry to the region, settling in different areas and gaining experience with indigenous birds.

The Second Generation spans the years 1966 to 1985. These falconers learnt the art from first generation falconers and consolidated the practice. They formed the regional falconry clubs, including the Zimbabwe Falconry Club, The Natal Falconry Club and the Transvaal Falconry Club. They started the process of dealing with legislation and falconry "policies". They became involved with research, conservation issues and the captive breeding of falconry birds.

The Third Generation spans the years 1986 to 2006, and is represented by the 200 South African falconers and the 35 Zimbabwean falconers that exist today. Established falconry policies, negotiated between the conservation authorities and falconers, exist in both these countries. Falconry is currently prohibited in Namibia and there is no policy regarding falconry in any of the other countries in the region, although falconry has been practiced sporadically, by a very small number of individuals in Botswana, over many years.

What are the characteristics of Southern African falconry? Falconers in Southern Africa often come from a naturalist, rather than a hunting background. We see falconry as a minimally consumptive sustainable use activity which promotes the con-

servation of both raptors and quarry species. Indeed, falconry is an activity that well fits the concepts of the Convention of Biodiversity that envisage the extension of conservation through the principle of sustainable use.

Falconers in Southern Africa enjoy a small harvest of wild raptors for use in falconry, based on a negotiated quota. This process encourages their involvement in conservation and population monitoring activities and reduces the need for trade in raptors. It also stimulates the use of indigenous birds, rather than exotic or hybrid raptors. In terms of the negotiated policies, the falconers are self-regulating, so reducing the administrative burden on the conservation authorities. The administration of the sport is performed by the regional falconry clubs. An apprentice system has been established and there is a grading system that determines the type of birds that a falconer may fly, dependent on his experience.

Falconry is practiced with "longwings" including Lanner and African Peregrine Falcons and with "shortwings" which include a variety of Sparrowhawks and Goshawks, the dramatic Black Sparrowhawk is probably the flagship species of our region.

In terms of feathered quarry we are spoilt for choice. Guinea fowl, a variety of spur-fowl species and a variety of duck species are hunted. Our champagne falconry is to be had under the big-skies of the Highveld grasslands where Greywing, Redwing and Orange River Francolin are hunted.

Falconers in the region participate actively in scientific research. The late Ron Hartley, of Zimbabwe, set the tone in this regard with a prodigious 150 publications. The contribution from others in South Africa is less well recognized as many contributors are scientists first, and falconers second, but this amounts to an impressive bibliography. Falconers contribute to a wide range of conservation-related activities. This involvement has been recognized and encouraged. We are currently in the process of signing a Memorandum of Understanding with the Bird of Prey Working Group of The Endangered Wildlife Trust.

Over the years Falconers in Southern Africa have had to counter a number of threats and challenges from a variety of quarters. These have included Scientists, Conservationists, Legislators, Animal Rightists and the purely ill-informed. We have dealt with these by keeping our house in order and engaging with our critics when-ever possible. Our present acceptance is proof of the success of this policy. To our amazement, our latest challenge comes from an unexpected quarter. Prof Gerhard Verdoorn, Director of BirdLife South Africa, has a regular column in "SA Wild en Jagter". In the October 2005 edition he contributed an article on the Peregrine Falcon. This article contains a number of inaccuracies and within it he states:

"Some individuals in the falconry circles are constantly looking for nests to collect young from and this, as far as I am concerned, is unacceptable. There is nothing wrong with the principles of falconry but nest robbing for falconry will never be acceptable to conservationists." This statement is patently untrue.

Firstly, Peregrine falcons are harvested in very small numbers by falconers, in accordance with negotiated sustainable quotas. In the year prior to his article, 3 Peregrines were taken from the wild. No nests were "robbed". In fact, none of these were taken from a nest; all were free flying first year birds (known as passage birds) which have a particular attraction to falconers as they have already developed flying and hunting skills. Most of

Continued on Page 20

Continued from Page 19

14 Falconry, a South African Heritage in the Making

the peregrines required by falconers were produced by captive breeding and a surplus is released to the wild.

Secondly, whatever his personal views, it is untrue to state that a wild harvest is never acceptable to conservationists. Apart from the aspersion that he casts at the capable conservationists who have accepted this harvest in southern Africa and, indeed in other nations which include the USA and Ireland, we would like to ask him how he correlates this statement with the Convention on Biodiversity, that guides current conservation thought. Specifically how he correlates it with Articles 10 and 11 of that convention.

Our attempts to take him to task through the medium of that magazine have met with no response. A letter to the Chairman of the board of BirdLife South Africa has not been given the courtesy of a reply.

Falconry in Southern Africa must look to the future. We need to consolidate our efforts in contributing to scientific research and to the conservation effort. We have taken our place within the international falconry community and are confident that our standards of falconry match the best in the world. We look forward to hosting the International Association for Falconry Meeting in 2008.

We need to extend an appreciation of falconry to all members of our society and encourage them to value falconry and the raptors that we cherish. One of the greatest statesmen in South Africa's recent history is the Archbishop Emeritus the Rev. Desmond Tutu. It was he who coined the phrase "Our Rainbow Nation" to characterize the rich mix of colors, creeds and practices that comprise our national heritage. Thus I can stand before my nation and say "I am a falconer. This is the bright fragment that I contribute to the patchwork. It is my heritage that I bring to you."

Dr Lombard can be contacted at lombarda@mweb.co.za. He is Chairman Cape Falconry Club, Secretary South African Falconry Association and representative for SAFA to the International Association for Falconry, and to the Endangered Wildlife Trust.

Feedback from African Indaba Readers

I have been reading the Indaba for the past two years and have found the information therein most interesting and helpful. The problem of emotionally charged arguments in the conservation debate is a worldwide problem, and I have found in African Indaba a perfect source to put some reason into that debate.

B-E Hanses, Finland

I really enjoy receiving African Indaba as it provides plenty of interesting news which is essential for remaining in touch with what is happening in Africa. Keep up the good work. I really appreciate your efforts.

Eugene Taljaard, South Africa

I have been reading your newsletter frequently and I am very impressed. There is simply no other information on hunting in Africa available with this kind of depth and no nonsense style.

Rainer Josch, Tanzania

15 Namaqua Sandgrouse: A Proposal to Conserve the Unpredictable

By Dr. Aldo Berruti, Director, [AGRED](#)

Introduction

Species which show unpredictable movements and concentrations pose considerable challenges for the policy and legislation framework of conservation action for such species, as well as for their implementation of conservation action.

This article examines the example of the Namaqua Sandgrouse *Pterocles namaqua* in southern Africa – looking at problems of definition, biological understanding and of implementing conservation action. It resurrects the proposed Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between three southern African nations for the conservation of the Namaqua Sandgrouse.

Migrant or Nomad?

Definitions of migration include a constraint of predictability. Thus the definition of the Convention on Migratory Species is "*Migratory species* means the entire population or any geographically separate part of the population of any species or lower taxon of wild animals, a significant proportion of whose members cyclically and predictably cross one or more national jurisdictional boundaries". A definition of a nomadic species is one which wanders erratically usually in reference to rainfall and/or food.

However, for some species, it is not simple to determine whether movements are to be regarded as migratory or nomadic. Several bird species which occur in the vast and sparsely inhabited interior of Southern Africa show unpredictable movements at a local level. This region is characterized by rainfall which is variable in timing and extent, which drives the unpredictability.

For example, the Namaqua Sandgrouse is described as "nomadic; southern populations partially migratory..." The Namaqua Sandgrouse is regarded as showing regular east-west movements related to breeding within northern South Africa and Botswana whilst being more sedentary in Namibia. Yet these movements were not revealed by the series of detailed two-monthly maps of this species as shown in the Atlas of Southern African Birds based on data collected over a decade. This analysis was based on a considerable numbers of observations, yet failed to show these patterns, probably because of the inter-annual variation in rainfall and hence movements, and which were masked when lumped together. The current understanding of the movements of the Namaqua Sandgrouse was later elucidated by detailed studies on the Namaqua Sandgrouse but further work on the extent and predictability of movement is required.

Another example is the Black-winged Pratincole, which breeds in Eurasia from the Black Sea to Kazakhstan and winters in the interior of Southern Africa from the Highveld grasslands of South Africa in the east to Botswana and Zambia in the north and west. The species usually occurs in flocks, but its occurrence locally is utterly unpredictable.

The definition of whether these two species are migratory or

Continued on Page 21

Continued from Page 20

15 Namaqua Sandgrouse: a Proposal to Conserve the Unpredictable

nomads depends entirely on the scale at which movements are considered. At the continental scale the movement of Black-winged Pratincole is regular and cyclical, moving from Northern Hemisphere breeding areas to Southern Hemisphere wintering areas. There is no question that at this scale, the Pratincole is a migratory species however unpredictable at a local level.

The Namaqua Sandgrouse is also a migratory species. At a subcontinent scale, it shows regular, annual movements from west to east in conjunction with rainfall patterns. Again, at a local scale, their occurrence and abundance is far less predictable.

Further problems in biological understanding

Both of these species are excellent examples of the technical difficulties in understanding the biology of species which breed and occupy sparsely populated areas with variable environmental conditions.

The Black-winged Pratincole was estimated to number between 25 000 and 45 000 birds until recently. In 1990, a single flock in the eastern Free State was estimated to number 250 000 – 800 000 birds, whilst an observation of a migratory movement of this species in Zambia in 1977 estimated 100 000 to one million birds. More recently, a waterbird count on the Vaal Dam (with a shoreline >1000 km) in central South Africa, produced a count of 75 000 Black-winged Pratincoles, a species not recorded in three previous counts. It is very difficult defining its global population size (a basic population parameter), let alone determining population trends.

Similarly, the unpredictability of the Namaqua Sandgrouse at a local scale from year-to-year makes evaluation of population size and trends very difficult.

Problems in implementation of conservation action

Unpredictability at the local scale poses formidable conservation and management problems from year to year. The usual system of protected areas for conservation of core areas of high abundance or breeding concentrations cannot be implemented. A further problem lies in the practical difficulties of providing an effective enforcement process (if suitable legislation exists) or even providing an educational and awareness program for the highly scattered and isolated communities living in these areas. This is exacerbated in regions such as Africa in which the infrastructure for conservation and education are inadequate compared to the western hemisphere.

International Agreement on Sandgrouse in Southern Africa.

With this background of the difficulties of understanding the biology of such species, the difficulties of developing a policy framework and legislation, and the practical difficulties of enforcing legislation or creating voluntary compliance with legislation; it is worth remembering a draft Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) exists for the Namaqua Sandgrouse. During the 1990s, considerable progress was made by Botswana, South Africa and Namibia on the MOU.

The development of the MOU was sparked in part by perceptions of declining populations, although it is an abundant species, and the impact of hunting on population size. There are two particular problems relating to its utilization through hunting. The birds are usually hunted from fixed points as they fly to waterholes to drink. Although there are well-known specific guidelines for ethical and sustainable hunting, the species is vulnerable to unscrupulous exploitation perhaps resulting in unsustainable

harvests. Secondly, the sympatric Burchell's Sandgrouse *Pterocles burchelli* usually breeds during the hunting season for Namaqua Sandgrouse. The impact of incidental harvesting of Burchell's Sandgrouse during its breeding season is more likely to result in unsustainable and ethically unacceptable harvests. These issues are set against the fact that global population trends for both species may be driven by macro-scale climatic patterns or land-use patterns which are immensely difficult to elucidate versus the immediate and visible hunting harvests.

International co-operation via this MOU could contribute enormously e.g. through a network of observers to understanding the biological basis for movements of this species. Ideally, if suitable technology were available satellite tracking of some 10-20 individuals would provide valuable additional information.

Implementation of the MOU could prove to be a groundbreaking African example of international co-operation on a species inherently difficult to manage and conserve.

Implementation of the sandgrouse MOU

Ultimately successful conservation of the sandgrouse will be reliant on voluntary compliance, as the cost of infrastructure to enforce unpopular regulations is beyond the capacity (finance and staffing) of provincial and even national conservation departments in this region. Voluntary compliance will depend on the setting of credible regulations based on sound biological understanding, and which promote the vision of long-term sustainable utilization and conservation of this species throughout its range. Implementation will depend to a large degree on a far-reaching awareness and educational program reaching the isolated and sparsely distributed communities.

It is time to look again at the draft MOU for the Namaqua Sandgrouse, which provides a solid foundation. I propose that international negotiations are reinitiated. Perhaps an understanding that implementation of such an agreement is to a large degree dependent on the co-operation and involvement by civil society would lend new impetus to governments who might be reluctant to take on new international commitments.

References

1. Hockey, P.A.R., Dean, W.R.J. & Ryan, P.G. (Eds). 2005. Roberts – Birds of South Africa, VII ed. Trustees of John Voelcker Bird Book Fund, Cape Town.
2. Little, R.M. 1997. Namaqua Sandgrouse. In Harrison, J.A. *et al.* (eds) The Atlas of Southern African Birds Vol.2: 494-495.
3. Lloyd, P., Little, R.M., Crowe, T.M. & Simmons, R.E. 2001. Rainfall and food availability as actors influencing the migration and breeding activity of Namaqua Sandgrouse *Pterocles namaqua*. Ostrich 72: 50-62.
4. Malan, G., Little, R.M. & Crowe, T. 1994. Temporal and spatial patterns of abundance and breeding activity of Namaqua Sandgrouse in South Africa. S. Afr. J. Zool. 29: 162.
5. Viljoen, P.J. 2005. AGRED's Gamebirds of South Africa Field Identification and Development. African Gamebird Research Education and Development Trust, Johannesburg.
6. Hagemeyer, W.J.M. & Blair, M.J. 1997. The EBCC Atlas of European Breeding Birds: their distribution and Abundance. Poyser, London.
7. Du Plessis, G.J. 1995. Large aggregations of Black-winged Pratincoles *Glareola nordmanni* in eastern Free State. Ostrich 66: 40-41.
8. Aspinwall, D.R. & Conant, P. 1977. Palearctic migrants. Newsl. Zambian Ornithol. Soc. 7: 98.
9. Avian Demography Unit 2006. Citizen Science Again. Africa Birds & Birding 11 (2): 79.

For more information about African Gamebirds contact Dr Aldo Berruti, Director, [African Gamebird Research Education and Development Trust](http://www.african-gamebird-research-education-and-development-trust.org) (AGRED), email agred@netdial.co.za

16 Development of Game Prices in South Africa

by Gerhard R Damm

Since 2003, African Indaba has informed the readers with statistics about the development of prices for game offered at live game sales around the country. We have not yet finalized the statistics for 2005 for publication, but there are some conclusions which can be drawn already now, and which are important in connection with other ongoing discussions, especially in connection with the proposed introduction of a new and comprehensive hunting regulation in South Africa (see African Indaba Vol. 3 No 2 for comparative statistics for the years 2002 to 2004 – download the pdf file by clicking [here](#)).

The most significant development for 2005 is the drastic drop both in game offered and in value realized. Whereas in 2004, a total of 21,101 heads of game were auctioned off, the total dropped to 17,569 for 2005 (a reduction of 16.7%). Although the average sales price of game animals rose from R4,920 (2004) to R5,350 (2005), the lesser number of animals on auction made for a total drop in revenue from just over 104 million Rand (2004) to 93.6 million Rand in 2005. The higher 2005 average price can arguably be traced back on certain low volume species which have been auctioned in 2005 but not in 2004. For instance, elephant (21 sold at R24,762 average), leopard (3 sold at R32,667 average), lion (39 sold R21,833 average), scimitar-horned oryx (4 sold at R17,000 each), golden cat (2 sold at R10,000 each) and some exotics like Bengal tiger (5 sold at R34,400 average) and water buffalo (4 sold at R21,00 average).

The auction prices for most game animals have dropped, some rather significantly, in 2005. For instance, the average price of R111,155 for disease-free buffalo did not even reach the 2002 level; the price for “black” impala dropped to about a quarter of the prices realized since 2001; red lechwe reached a low of R4,750 – less than half of the 2002 price and a third of the 2004 price; the single black rhino sold in 2005 fetched R100,000 – a far cry from the half million Rand mark reached in both 2001 and 2002; its white cousin experienced a continuous drop from the record prices of 2001/2002 to fetch just under R100,000 average for 137 animals; both Roan and Sable experienced also significant drops. Astonishingly, springbuck, kudu, eland and impala had some revival, with prices mostly up.

In terms of numbers, impala leads the pack with 3,886 sold, in front of blue wildebeest (1,552) and blesbuck (1,502); other animals traded in significant numbers are: kudu (1,240), common springbuck (839), eland (777), gemsbuck (768), nyala (690), waterbuck (688), Burchell's zebra (684).

African Indaba will publish the final statistics for 2005 in pdf-format on the [2006 Archive Page](#) within the next 2 months. There you will also find the US-Dollar equivalents based on average yearly exchange rates.

Conclusions:

The signs are on the wall for some time already, and I expect no recovery in prices for the current year. Most land, which could or can be converted back from agricultural to wildlife habitat, has experienced this transformation already. The owners of land in transformation have been the buyers of wildlife in the past; and

they will become producers of wildlife once their game stocks are surpassing the carrying capacity of the fenced land.

The provincial and national protected areas in South Africa have long since been suppliers of wildlife for game auctions, since this is their only significant way to realize revenue from surplus game (the exception are a few “enlightened” provincial authorities, who also permit trophy and/or biltong hunting within their protected areas).

I envisage that the trade in life game will – especially with a tighter new legislation in the pipeline regarding game breeding, trade and also regarding land ownership resp. tax incentives, – experience further declines in 2006. We might well see a trend towards a situation, where, in order to maintain genetic diversification, game is rather exchanged than traded.

The game on private and public land will not stop to reproduce and game populations will quickly reach maximum carrying capacity level. Landowners, both public and private, are to manage their wildlife areas in terms of the National Biodiversity Act; social responsibility requires, however, not conservation-centrism, but a holistic triple-bottom-line approach with tangible ecological, economic and social benefits in line with the South African Government's stated policy.

Hunting can play an important role in the development. The Department of Tourism & Environmental Affairs would be well advised to draw on international expertise as offered by the International Council for Game and Wildlife Conservation – CIC. A close cooperation with wildlife producers (Wildlife Ranching South Africa, SA National Parks, Provincial Parks), local and tourist hunters (i. e. Confederation of South African Hunting Associations – CHASA, Professional Hunters' Association of SA – PHASA and international hunters' associations) is also essential.

I, therefore, state my point again – as I did already in the article “Hunting in South Africa: Facts, Risks, Opportunities”, published in African Indaba Vol 3, No 4 and 5, and in subsequent editorials as well as in the editorial remarks on page 1 of this issue of African Indaba:

We will have to find workable ways to achieve triple bottom line results in the protected areas in South Africa. As a foremost objective, the solutions must be inclusive of the vast, but silent majority of South Africans. We cannot afford to be dictated by utopian animal rights views of a small but vociferous urban minority and some media which make it their business to have un- and underinformed writers to misrepresent facts.

The “Fortress Mentality” of colonial preservationism must be replaced with a holistic “Incentive-Driven-Conservation” approach. This should include a combination of consumptive and non-consumptive use options on both public and private lands. The South African wildlife and indeed the biodiversity of the country depends on reaching solutions which might not be palatable at first glance for many, but which are nevertheless necessary to maintain the rich natural heritage of the country for generations to come.

Private conservation, which has contributed so much to the conservation revolution in South Africa during the past 40 years, and public conservation (national & provincial) must finally reach a symbiotic relationship. Now is the time for pragmatic solutions, new partnerships and out-of-the-box thinking!

The figures for this article are from Prof Theuns Eloff, University of the Northwest, Potchefstroom Campus).