

AFRICAN



INDABA

Volume 1, Issue No 4

SCI African Chapter Newsletter

July 2003

Dedicated to the People and Wildlife of Africa

1 African wildlife can survive without hunting – but not without money!

By Dr Rolf Baldus

Dr. Rolf Baldus presented a paper with this title during the international conference "Can African Wildlife Survive Without Hunting?" in Pretoria on April 4th, 2003. The conference was organized by Jan van der Walt of Game & Hunt, an independent monthly publication promoting the sustainable utilization of South Africa's natural resources. For details about subscription browse their website <http://www.wildlifehunt.co.za> or contact Jan van der Walt at janlouis@wildlifehunt.co.za, fax to 012-320-5561.

"Can African Wildlife Survive without Hunting?" ... is a question discussed at many campfires and conference tables. Most hunters would answer with a clear "Of course, African wildlife cannot survive without hunting".

South Africa is a wonderful example for proving this point. 5.000 exempt game ranches have brought wildlife back to places where it has not been for a very long time. And the motivation for many, if not most of these ranch owners, is hunting. Wildlife species that were nearly extinct, like the white rhino or the bontebok, are abundant again - to a great extent because they are hunted. As soon as Tanzanian officials were allowed by their Government to visit your country, 1993, I took the Director of Wildlife and the Chief Warden of the world's largest game reserve, the Selous, down to South Africa to visit Pilanesberg - formerly degraded land without ecological value, now a National Park plus hunting reserve. To us this seemed to be an impressive example where the whole range of uses was presented on a relatively small stretch of land - wilderness, simple campsites, luxury hotels and hunting. Different types of use complementing each other.

If South Africa would impose a hunting ban, as some African countries have, a great share of this wildlife would disappear in the near future.

However, the majority of mankind is of different opinion. For them African wildlife cannot survive with hunting. If we analyse the many newspaper articles, TV programs and scientific and semi-scientific and unscientific papers appearing on this topic, it will prove my point. If you participate in one of the huge international conferences where issues which touch you all, which make you earn money or lose money, are being decided - like whether South Africa is allowed to sell its ivory, export its rhino trophies or increase its leopard quota - you

will have to come up with very good arguments to make your point, namely that hunting can support conservation. You are up against masses of well-spoken scientists and of civil servants with directives from their Governments. You are up against animal welfare pressure groups, which spend every year millions of dollars to advertise their anti-use views.

You would be astonished, to know how many Government institutions in the European Union study at length the ways and practices of hunting in Africa. There are conferences and round tables with representatives from different sectors of society. Books, articles and position papers are written. Bureaucrats in their dozens shed their sweat in order to look into a wide range of issues whether it is hunting leopards with dogs, crocodile quotas, lion hunting or whether country x was allowed to have a certain elephant hunted. In Germany there was a court case, which confirmed the Government's position that the CITES authorities have the right to evaluate every individual case of importing an Appendix I trophy. It is legal to import a pair of tusks from the Tanzanian Selous, but the import of a pair of trophy tusks from the Longido area in Tanzania was refused, despite the Government of Tanzania having given CITES permission. German

Continued on Page 2

INSIDE THIS ISSUE

1. Guest Editorial: African wildlife can survive without hunting – but not without money
2. Wildlife – A factor to strengthen SADC
3. Young people – the biggest lobby group for sustainable use – says CIC
4. Culling elephant in Botswana
5. PHASA Conservation Fund
6. Semi automatic shotguns
7. Tannin poisoning of game animals
8. Game ranch profitability in South Africa
9. AWF carnivore project launched in Botswana
10. How do Geckos stick to the wall
11. Africa's most endangered duiker lives in Zanzibar
12. News from Africa
13. Northern Cape moves ahead with a bold step
14. WCS uses food security to conserve Zambia's wildlife
15. Shady deals in Zimbabwean hunting concession allocations
16. Chaos in the Kenya Wildlife Service
17. Events
18. African Chapter Special Meeting

2 Wildlife - a factor to strengthen SADC

The Angolan vice minister for Agriculture and Rural Development Daniel Dario Catata, considers wildlife as one of the important factors to strengthen unity and cooperation between the countries members of the Southern Africa Development Community (SADC). Dario Catata was speaking at the opening ceremony of a workshop in early May about "strategies to implement SADC's Protocol on Wildlife Management". Catata added that conservation of this renewable resource calls for joint efforts on a regional level, aimed at stopping or minimizing any factors endangering its survival. Southern Africa's bio-diversity is an important factor influencing the achievement of social, nutritional, economic and environmental objectives in the region. To this extent, wildlife fauna experts pursued debates seeking to outline a strategy for the implementation of the Community protocol on fauna resources conservation. The conclusions were submitted to the 28th technical committee meeting, which decided that transfrontier faunistic resources should be jointly managed by the countries of the region. The representative of SADC member countries also discussed the ratification of the Protocol on the Conservation of Faunistic Resources. The 12 states represented, agreed to implement the conventions on the Monitoring of Control and Illegal Killing of Elephants (MIKE) and the understanding on Wildlife Management (SACWM) in the region.

12 of the 14 SADC member countries participated (Seychelles and the Democratic Republic of Congo being absent). SADC comprises, Angola, South Africa, Botswana, Tanzania, Mozambique, Malawi, Swaziland, Lesotho, Mauritius, Seychelles, DR Congo, Namibia, Zimbabwe and Zambia.

Malawi was given the responsibility to coordinate the SADC's department for continental fishing, wildlife fauna and forests. These three groups meet once a year to analyze technical aspects of their respective programs and projects.

"The Conservation Game – Saving Africa's Biodiversity"

"Sustainable Use in Africa"

This 287 page textbook and the full colour poster (1000 x 700mm) published by the African Chapter have received high acclaim from the hunting fraternity as well as from conservation circles. Did you order your copy already?

Please support the on-going educational efforts of the Chapter by ordering some sets for distribution to your friends and clients. We all have the obligation to spread the message of sustainable use!

Order your copy for only R85.00 (postage included in RSA only) now. All funds received will be used for project continuation.

Email gerhard@muskwa.co.za or fax 011-784-2074

Continued from Page 1

1 African wildlife can survive without hunting

civil servants provided a scientific opinion that – at least in their view - the particular bull at Longido was indispensable for elephant reproduction in Amboseli in Kenya.

Depending on the respective Government some of these people might to a certain extent be prejudiced and be pro- or, more often, anti-hunting, but as a general rule most of these civil servants search for facts. They need them in order to take decisions - decisions that influence hunting enterprises in Africa a great deal. They look for answers to the question **Can African wildlife survive with hunting?**

They may indeed have good reasons to ask this question. Taking South Africa as an example: The barren land where Pilanesberg was founded, the farms where wildlife was introduced by game ranchers – at some time in the past there was plenty of game existing there, there were some of the biggest animal migrations the world has ever seen. Hunters exterminated this wildlife in a few decades. After Frederick Courtenay Selous had landed in Port Elizabeth in 1871 he wrote into his diary during his trip northwards: "One might look as well for game in Hyde Park". Wildlife had become scarce in South Africa by then, not only in the Cape, but also farther north in the Boer republics. We may say that the hunters who were responsible for the extinction had different motivations and were living in different times and conditions than the hunters now. Nevertheless, for the non-hunting observer they still were hunters.

However, I do not want to write about South Africa. My personal experience is East Africa, in particular Tanzania, where I had the privilege to work with wildlife for over ten years. It still is the Africa where wildlife roams in the wilderness, and the game ranch is unknown, where it is even illegal, where the people live side by side with dangerous big game. They are not kept separate by fences. Wildlife does not have to be controlled in numbers by culling, as is necessary in fenced game ranches or parks. Wildlife contributes significantly to the economy of the country, be it in the form of photographic tourism or in the form of hunting. The country has a tourist-hunting sector that in the last ten years has produced approximately 2.300 lions, 2.500 leopards, 5.000 buffaloes and 400 elephants, not to mention antelopes and other game.

With such off-takes, and for most species and most places the quotas are still sustainable, the country still seems to have quite a bit of wildlife – despite hunting or because of hunting?

At the same time the country has areas with spectacular concentrations of wildlife that are not hunted at all. Two million wildebeest, zebras and antelopes and 4 000 lions roam the Serengeti National Park. The country's highest concentration of elephants lives in the Tarangire National Park. The world's largest buffaloes (a 64-inch buffalo was killed by lions recently) occur in Lake Manyara National Park. These thriving wildlife populations are a living proof that wildlife in Africa can survive without hunting.

Therefore, I can say: Yes, wildlife can survive without hunting! In the Africa of today – characterized by overpopulation, threats of all kind to the environment, illegal wildlife uses, a growing unsustainable bush meat industry – in this

Continued on Page 3

Continued from Page 2

1 African wildlife can survive without hunting

Africa of today, such no-hunting reserves are important to preserve bio-diversity.

This is by the way nothing new at all. A keen hunter from Germany, Hermann von Wissmann, who happened to be the Governor of German East Africa, established the first two protected areas in Africa with similar arguments. This was 1896, and he called them “hunting reserves”, which indicated that no hunting was to take place there. Even at that time people were concerned that hunting might eliminate wildlife.

If we look around in Africa between the Sahara and the Limpopo, we find hundreds of such National Parks. Some countries have put up to 10 % of their land under such strict protection. In September there will be the World Parks Congress in Durban where the World Conservation Union expects more than 2 000 participants and where many of these will demand that many more of these National Parks should be created in Africa, so that in their opinion at least some African wildlife can survive.

Take my host country, Tanzania. Just recently a major piece of a hunting reserve was cut off and added to the Katavi National Park. I am presently involved in transforming the Saadani Game Reserve along the coast into a National Park. It will be the 13th National Park of Tanzania, and more are in the pipeline.

But our look around in sub-Saharan Africa also reveals: Many of these parks are “paper parks” only. They harbour more squatters, farmers, pastoralists and poachers than wild animals. They are run by game scouts who earn the equivalent of 30 US\$ a month and who are busy to make a living by turning the game which they hold in trust into bush meat and cash. They are parks that contribute to conservation statistics only.

Wildlife can survive in Africa without hunting – but only if somebody pays the bill. Cash is needed to conserve it – revenue is needed to tolerate it. It will survive only, if its value is higher than the opportunity costs that the owner of the land has to bear for his decision to have it on his land. Otherwise wildlife will disappear, as it has at many places already. It does not matter whether the landowner is an impoverished rural community or a well-to-do commercial large-scale farmer. The question is therefore: Will it be possible to provide the cash or to earn the money to satisfy the landowner without hunting?

After having worked with African wildlife for a great part of my life, **my empirical answer is NO.**

Photographic tourism is a great money-spinner at many places. At others it is not. Many areas with wildlife are just not suitable for tourism for a multitude of reasons. Hunting is the way to earn money there. Often the so-called “consumptive” and “non-consumptive” tourism can go hand in hand. They complement each other. I do not say that hunting is the panacea for wildlife conservation in Africa. But in most places it does not work without.

Many people might not like this fact. We live, however, in a world that is governed by economics and money. There is nothing like a free lunch. Animal enthusiasts do not help the elephants and other wild animals by thinking nicely about them or watching National Geographic videos – but they

would help them by allowing wildlife to earn the money that will sustain the species.

Africa’s protected areas have one thing in common – nearly all are greatly under-financed. Tourism income in most cases contributes to cost coverage of less than 30 %, and due to other priorities the necessary Government subsidies are not forthcoming; and how should they in poor countries? Whereas the minimum amount needed to run such a Park properly may be 300 US\$ per sq. km. - depending on many factors -, the actual amount available may be 30 US\$ or less. There are a good number of National Parks where the question is not how much tourism do they need, but how much tourism can they afford? Tourism costs them more than what it generates.

I have mentioned Katavi and Saadani National Parks in Tanzania. Katavi in the extreme west of the country has not much more than 100 visitors a year. Nevertheless a good part of an adjacent well earning hunting area was cut off and added to the National Park. Fortunately in Tanzania TANAPA is earning well in four profit-generating parks, the wealthiest of which is the Kilimanjaro Mountain. From this income they can subsidise 9 loss-making parks. But this is a rare case in Africa and this may quickly change, if tourism suffers further from international instability. In Saadani, my own baby, I advised strongly against a National Park. I would have preferred a multiple-use area, managed by a private entrepreneur - something like a private Game Reserve in South Africa. Even if he had not paid the Government a single cent for the lease of the land, public budgets would have benefited. The conventional National Park system has its merits, but has also reached its limits in Africa. We have to find new solutions – multiple use, new sources of self-finance, community involvement based on less government dominance, and more private sector involvement. In a good number of countries it is, however, still a sacrilege to think along these lines.

A few weeks ago I was in Benin, and I met with Djaffarou Tiomoko, the Director of Pendjari National Park and three neighbouring hunting reserves. He told me that tourism just about covers its costs. Pendjari is one of the best Parks in West Africa, but nevertheless cannot compete with Parks like Krueger. It is just not attractive enough, and it is too expensive to get there. Last year he earned five times as much with 72 hunters on 177 sq km. than with 3.800 tourists on 275 sq km.

Another example is the Selous Game Reserve in Tanzania, where I have worked for 6 years. In 1987 this protected area received not more than 3 US-\$ per sq km. from the Government budget. Due to careful development and improved management income from photographic tourism has increased 15 fold over the last 15 years and hunting revenue has trebled. Nevertheless hunting accounts for 90% of all income. Of course it is also important what is being done with the revenue, whether it is used for offices, cars and per diems in the capital or reinvested into conservation. In the case of the Selous a “retention scheme” was introduced by which the reserve keeps around 50% of its income. 1987 there were 5.000 elephants poached annually, and the carcass ratio was close to 20%. Presently less than 50 elephants die per annum due to poaching. The elephant population has more than doubled again. Without the hunting revenue the situation

Continued on Page 4

3 Young people: The biggest lobby group for sustainable use – says CIC

On 21 May 2003, the 50th General Assembly of the International Council for Game and Wildlife Conservation (CIC) in Helsinki, Finland, opened with the international symposium “Youth of the World for Sustainable Use”. Representatives of the UN, governments, universities and hunters’ organizations from around the world gathered to discuss the education of young people and teachers in order to enhance their responsibility for wildlife conservation and sustainable use.

H.M. King Juan Carlos I of Spain, patron of the CIC, stated in his message that CIC’s initiative “is an outstanding contribution for the education of our future generations. Only by learning the true functions and complexities of nature can our young people develop suitable plans for the conservation of our planet’s biodiversity”.

“Implementing the principle of sustainable use is an elementary responsibility of the young generation”, stressed Dr. Douglas Williamson from FAO, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the UN. He said sustainability is threatened by man’s alienation and indifference to nature and wildlife. Hence, these problems have to be taken seriously and need to be clearly defined. “Partnerships between the concerned organizations, the UN-System included, are crucial to address this matter and to properly educate the youth”, expressed Williamson.

“Children and their families are the biggest lobby group in each country”, reads the experience of Tony Frost, President of WWF South Africa. The South African example could be a guideline for other countries to incorporate environmental matters including wildlife in school education at all levels.

John Swift, CEO of the British Association for Shooting and Conservation (BASC) outlined his organization’s approach by emphasizing “inspiration by using the right language”, which means effective communication in the media as well as “action learning” in nature and promoting hunting as a form of sustainable use.

Majid Al Mansouri, Secretary-General of the Environmental Research and Wildlife Development Agency of the United Arab Emirates, highlighted the importance of “outdoor festivals” organized with the intention of getting young people interested in environment, wildlife and hunting.

“Education must make fun when we are to bring urban citizens back in nature!” was the conclusion of John A. Tomke, President of the old and renowned North American conservation organization Ducks Unlimited.

“Better to convince one teacher than only one pupil!” summarized Ray Lee, President of the Foundation for North American Wild Sheep. The Foundation offers active participation in wildlife conservation for young people. Chances to accompany hunters in the field are only one part of this.

The aversion to hunting often shown by young people seems to be a result of weak communication, stressed Dr. Roger Bush, Director of the TTN Institute of Applied Ethics

Continued from Page 3

1 African wildlife can survive without hunting

would look quite different.

Another issue, which I shall not further discuss in this paper, despite its importance, is the conservation of wildlife on community land. Fortunately in many countries there is still much wildlife living outside the protected areas. It is generally accepted nowadays that this wildlife will not survive, if the communities are not benefiting, if the wildlife is just a nuisance and a cost to them. Sometimes tourists with cameras are the answer, more often, however, it is sustainable use by people who carry guns. Wildlife is a renewable resource, and it can be used wisely for the benefit of poor people who share the land with the game.

Now, what is the solution then proposed by those who refuse sustainable wildlife use in such situations? Their answer is simple. Let the outside world finance it. All over Africa dozens of funds are in the making with the aim to provide “sustainable finance” for the continent’s protected areas. One of the extreme examples is the “Leakey Fund” in Kenya which tries to collect 400 million US\$ from wildlife lovers and foreign Governments. At the same time Kenya has outlawed the use of hunting as a money earner for conservation and landowners for over 25 years now. During this time the country has lost half of its wildlife. This is not a very good record to prove the success of a conservation strategy based on a hunting ban. The little culling for meat that is still legal on few big properties in the country should also be outlawed, declared the Kenyan Director of Wildlife in a newspaper article, which appeared on April 1st this year in Nairobi. With an endowment fund of 400 million US\$ the country would indeed have solved many of the financial problems of the Kenya Wildlife Service. Practical experience of 40 years of development cooperation with Africa shows, however, that money, which is provided for free, is normally not put to optimal use, but more often it is spent inefficiently. And one question remains unanswered in such cases: Why should the taxpayers of comparatively rich countries which nevertheless do not ban hunting for economic (and other) reasons spend their hard earned money for poor countries which outlaw hunting for ideological reasons thereby not utilizing one of their most valuable resources?

The World Conservation Union has confirmed 2002 in Amman amongst others that the sustainable use of wildlife can be an important conservation tool. The IUCN Policy Statement on Sustainable Use of Wild Living Resources contains, however, also conditions, which have to be fulfilled in order that such use is really positive for nature. Other institutions have followed. I should like to mention as an example the German Federal Agency for Nature Conservation (BfN), which outlined rules and procedures for trophy hunting in Africa as a means to contribute to bio-diversity and not to reduce it. The International Council for Hunting and Conservation of Game (CIC) or the Sheep Specialist Group of IUCN came up with similar documents. They all are of the opinion that hunting can contribute to the conservation of wildlife and the preservation of bio-diversity provided certain conditions are met. As a casual observer of the South African

Continued on Page 6

Continued on Page 5

4 Culling elephant in Botswana

By Gerhard R Damm

“The ideology of open-ended international trade bans is pushed relentlessly by fundamentalist animal rights groups and is rigidly applied to virtually all species of wildlife. This proves to be self-serving since these groups also manage to sustain themselves extremely comfortably with the billions of dollars raised each year for their “save the...” campaigns” (Dr Eugene Lapointe, former Secretary General of CITES)

The Botswana elephant culling debate got new momentum with the entry of One & Only, Sol and Butch Kerzner’s venture, to set up a very exclusive game lodge at Chobe. It is reported that One & Only is concerned that the massive over population of elephant in the Chobe National Park is turning the area into a “single species reserve”, as the significant ecological damage caused by huge elephant herds drives less robust species of antelope into local extinction in addition to causing virtually irreparable damage to the ancient riverine forest. Since scientist forecast a massive die-off of elephant, if present protectionist elephant management policies are not reversed, the economic feasibility of future luxury ecotourism destinations hangs at the thin thread of active human management of Chobe’s biodiversity (and those of other elephant habitats in the country too). Latest reports anyhow suggest that the Kerzner’s do not view Chobe as a prime location anymore, since it is “overrun by tourists and irreversible damage to the local flora has seriously changed biodiversity”. But Mr Kerzner need not be too worried – there are still locations in Botswana, where small-scale and high price ecotourism would be able to prosper and coexist with the denizens of the wilderness. Should One & Only go into partnership with Debswana – who obviously recognized the lure of the eco-tourism business despite of the eternal glittering of diamonds, these two giants in their respective fields will have opportunities which could revolutionize the public perception of wildlife conservation. And setting the natural balance right – especially the elephant balance, which concerns their ecotourism ventures – would be just such an opportunity.

Anti-culling activists routinely link culling and sustainable use of wildlife with what they call “apartheid era conservation management”. It seems that these allegations – which are made without substantiation and proof – are used to further charge a subject with unrelated but potent political emotions. Using a cool head and the substantial scientific proof available would be rather more appropriate in a situation, which can be described only as desperate!

During a recent visit to the Moremi area, I saw ample proof of the elephants’ destructive power caused by an unprecedented overpopulation. The international animal rights lobby knowingly accepts irreversible ecological damage and eventually a tragically massive elephant die-off in order to fill their financial coffers with the dollars of a well meaning, but totally misinformed international public. They are shrugging off the consequences with “let nature run its course” without taking into account the cost of their actions, or rather “inac-

Continued on Page 6

Continued from Page 4

1 African wildlife can survive without hunting

wildlife scene I have the impression that this discussion has also started here. I should like to mention the new bi-monthly newsletter of the African Chapter “African Indaba” as a good example.

Unlike other parts of Africa it is not the sustainability of wildlife use that has to be questioned in this country. The more pressing issues seem to be of biodiversity and ethics. It will be a painful process to find answers, as economic interests are at stake – but the discussion cannot be further postponed.

If the wildlife producers, the game ranchers, the professional hunters, the operators and the pro-use scientists do not find the solutions themselves, others might find solutions for them.

Bibliography:

Grosse, C. et al. (2001): *Trophäenjagd auf gefährdete Arten im Ausland*. BfN Positionspapier, Bonn (www.bfn.de)

IUCN Caprinae Specialist Group (2000): *Position Statement on Trophy Hunting*

Jagen im Ausland (2000) *Positionspapier des Deutschen Jagdschutz-Verbandes (DJV) und des Internationalen Jagdrates zur Erhaltung des Wildes (CIC), Deutsche Delegation, Bonn* (www.jvv.de/archiv/anreisser_archiv_5605.html)

Disclaimer:

This paper reflects the personal opinions of the author and not necessarily those of any of the organizations he works for.

AI

5 The PHASA Conservation Fund

The principal way of raising funds is by means of a levy, PHASA members charge on each animal hunted by overseas hunters. Currently this levy stands at \$10 per animal for American clients and €10 for clients from the European Community. Each contributing client gets a certificate which recognizes the hunter for “having contributed the specified amount to assist the Professional Hunting Industry with its efforts to promote and maintain the wise consumptive use of natural resources of South Africa”.

All visiting hunters are urged to ask their professional hunter and/or outfitter that they want to contribute to this important fund. They will receive a copy of the levy hunting register stipulating the donated amount.

The PHASA Conservation Fund is formally registered with the Registrar of Companies under Section 21 of the SA Companies’ Act.

Editor’s Comment: PHASA is to be commended for having initiated this fund. The monies generated will assist in safeguarding the future of safari hunting in South Africa.

For details about PHASA go to www.professionalhunters.co.za

AI

Continued from Page 4

3 Young people: the biggest lobby group ...

at the Ludwig-Maximilian-University of Munich. Hunting needs to be described as technically correct, morally based and therefore ethically essential.

“How can wildlife science contribute to a better understanding of nature by young people?” asked Prof. Sándor Csányi from the Gödöllő University of Agricultural Sciences, Hungary. He answered himself by urging scientists to leave their “ivory tower” and to articulate sustainable use and hunting in an easily understandable way. Csányi also called upon wildlife management education to broaden its focus on socio-cultural aspects. “Face to face presentations” of experts in kindergartens, schools and at excursions must form part of this approach.

Finally, CIC’s youth organization Young Opinion presented the first outcome of a study on the acceptance of hunting and hunters among young people in Germany and a project on how to create a better image by using modern means of marketing.

The CIC General Assembly endorsed the proposal to create a platform for interlinking several approaches on an international level. The CIC underlined youth education as a principal goal of its activities, and was able to initiate that international conventions such as CITES agree on seeking possibilities to include youth education in their tasks. “We have to enhance young people’s respect for nature and wildlife”, concludes CIC Director General Kai Wollscheid, and calls for “a holistic view and global partnership”. This, in fact, is what the CIC stands for.

If you want to know more about CIC, its mission and aims please browse the website of the International Council for Game and Wildlife Conservation <http://www.cic-wildlife.org/>

AI

6 Semi-automatic shotguns

According to information received from PHASA, the South African Police Services (SAPS) has implemented even stricter controls on semi-automatic firearms.

This will affect overseas hunters wanting to bring in semi-automatic shotguns into South Africa on temporary import permits. The latest requirement which came in effect immediately is that no temporary import permit for such firearms will be issued unless the application is made in advance together with a motivational letter as to why such a shotgun is needed. The application must be made through the Central Firearms Registry.

The SAPS requests applications to be made well in advance so that the necessary administrative work can be completed authorizing the issuing of the permit before the hunter arrives in South Africa. Applications on arrival will not be considered, neither will permits be issued.

Hunters are advised to contact their outfitter and/or PHASA (email: phasa@pixie.co.za) in case of any questions regarding import of firearms. Due to the fluctuating status regarding the implementation of the new firearm regulations, we suggest that visiting hunters stay in contact with their outfitters and/or booking agents.

AI

Continued from Page 5

4 Culling elephant in Botswana

tions”. Derek Joubert – a renowned wildlife filmmaker – who is reported to have lobbied also for the closure of sustainable lion hunting in Botswana, obviously also entered the elephant culling debate by stating that “lion in Chobe are preying on elephant ... and that any management interference like culling would prevent people from people to observe such surprising behavior”. I suggest that Mr Joubert rather contemplates that the total protection of elephant, their concentration in certain areas, caused by a human sea surrounding isolated islands of wildlife and accelerated die-off caused by stress and hunger are the root causes of that predator adaptation. His suggestions of translocating elephants and opening Transfrontier Conservation Areas are also rather naïve. Who will fund the capturing and transport? The cost – irrespective of the logistical problems – will run into thousands of dollars per animal. And elephant are known to return to their ancestral home range in the unfenced parks of Botswana and the neighboring countries. The reproductive rate of elephant populations is an additional factor animal rightists conveniently forget. Various sources put it between 6 and 10% per year! Northern Botswana has certainly a population close to 100 000 elephants (if not more, but I like to stay conservative) – which would mean that between 6 000 and 10 000 elephants have to be removed EVERY YEAR just to maintain the status quo! Translocation – notwithstanding the cost – would mean that the problem is only shifted to future years and other areas (if the animals don’t re-migrate). Joubert – who is concerned with selling his wildlife movies to a worldwide public – says that “any decisions on whether to cull elephants or not need to be made on a conservation basis and should not be influenced by business decisions”. Doesn’t he have a business interest? Bleeding heart movies of elephant herds sell better than thoroughly researched facts presented with the necessary scientific background and with unpopular solutions!

Culling, however, presents its own set of problems. If an ecologically neutral result is the aim, as it should be, culling is not just an exercise in killing several thousand elephants per year. Finding and training suitable culling crews is most likely the least problem. What is significantly more important is the absolute condition that the carcasses of culled elephants are completely (and this word has to be taken literally) removed from the eco-system. The “old” culling procedures of the former Rhodesia certainly would not fit in our modern understanding of biodiversity management. Any significant leaving of elephant meat and bones would invariably lead to a quick population explosion of predators within the system. Significantly larger predator populations would cause serious problems for other wildlife (although filmmakers like Joubert would no doubt be able to document “interesting predator behaviour on video”).

The massive culling of elephant in Botswana would also need to be justified by assuring that every part of the animal is used and a substantial part of the economic benefit accrues to conservation. I argue that no wildlife department in Africa presently has the human and financial resources to success-

Continued on Page 7

Continued from Page 6

4 Culling elephant in Botswana

fully enter into such a venture. Here is the chance for the private sector to contribute to biodiversity conservation and at the same time get a just entrepreneurial reward for assuming the financial risk of entering the scene. One & Only's and Debswana's eco-tourist ventures could certainly gain momentous credibility, if their selected high-end eco-tourist projects would be complemented with a consequential investment into wildlife management. That need not be done for free and just entrepreneurial rewards are totally in order, as long as part of the profit is ploughed back into conserving the country's wildlife areas within and outside protected areas. It would admittedly be a "hard-sell" to the worldwide public that killing elephants is actually saving them AND biodiversity's rich treasures, but the PR resources at the disposal of these organizations could effectively disseminate factual and scientific back-up information and show that "bleeding-heart-campaigns" are doing far more damage than good to wildlife!

My discussions with people who have experience in elephant culling have led me to look deeper into the practical issues connected with culling. Logistics is the most obvious problem. Elephant culling would normally be done in rather inaccessible areas with poor road or bush-track networks. Entire elephant carcasses will have to be removed from the field with a relatively short time to avoid contamination of the meat fit for human consumption. This would require well trained crews and workers with heavy equipment like flat-bed trucks, front-loaders and lifting equipment. Mobility will be paramount, since operations would have to shift within relatively short periods to new areas. Centralized stations would do the first processing like skinning and salting skin panels, extraction of ivory, separation of meat and offal into material fit for human consumption and such parts which will be used for other purposes, etc. Massive amounts of water will be necessary for these processes, so proximity to water and mobile waste water plants are essential, as are basic refrigeration for transport of the meat in refrigerator trucks to the meat processing plants.

Botswana does not need advice on meat processing, since the country's rich experience in the beef industry is certainly a huge asset, which could be used in that connection. Yes – elephant meat could become a second Botswana export success story and at the same time alleviate the hunger in neighboring countries. Vacuum packed and frozen for the high end market, processed and canned bully-elephant for the protein starved population in other African countries and as biltong for many of the outlying rural areas in Botswana, who yet have to accrue some credible benefit from their wildlife and their immense efforts to keep vast portions of the country under wildlife for the enjoyment of overseas tourists.

Let it be said – elephant meat is tasty – not only to the local populations within the present game management areas, who routinely get their share of elephant meat obtained through sport hunting. An elephant stew was the recent highlight of a stay at a hunting camp in one of the hunting concessions. A couple of non-hunting elephant lovers were with me, and they all attested the palatability of that dinner! I still remember the "agh shame" exclamations, but even they could not escape having noticed the habitat destruction caused by

elephants, and being persons of reason, they did not refuse to use the available resources, presented to them as stew cooked in an environment friendly solar oven!

Pet food is an expanding industry – and nothing prevents that industry from using offal, bone meal and whatever meat not used for human consumption for canned pet food and for the production of the many forms of pellets. There are certainly also possibilities and uses in the chemical, fertilizer, and other industries to make sure that nothing is wasted.

Elephant hides can be turned into fine leather and this again into high-priced leather goods. That would mean tanneries to process the huge amount of elephant skin, and then a variety of possibilities to work the leather on an industrial and artisanal scale.

Finally the ivory! Although culling operations should spare large bulls wherever possible and concentrate on breeding herds, a relatively large amount of ivory would be harvested annually. To export this ivory under the present scheme in its raw form to Japan is – in my opinion – a wasted opportunity to create jobs and wealth exactly there where the elephants occur and where the major benefit should also be reaped! Ivory carvers can be trained and a local high class ivory carving industry can be created. Let the Japanese aid agencies know that Africans want to create added value where it matters most for Africans. Make them teach Africans their wealth of experience in ivory carving – we have exported raw material only far too long! And most importantly – make ivory products socially acceptable again! I hear some crying out loud now – the demise of all African elephants will be pre-programmed by such an action and poaching will reach unheard of scales! Not so, I argue – since modern technology enables us to unalterably mark each piece of processed ivory and certify its legality and origin. Actually, the legalization and social acceptance of worked ivory would most likely kill the illegal market, since the legally achievable prices would not warrant the risks of illegality and since Africans would ferociously protect their valuable assets against poachers.

I have sketched some of the practical problems and possible solutions. What I did not mention so far are the significant employment possibilities for rural people and a general positive impact on household income with all its ramifications like child welfare, employment for women, health aspects, etc. The entire country and its population will benefit, as will conservation areas – protected or open. Finally wildlife, Botswana's flora and fauna, will benefit in two ways – biodiversity will be restored to the delicate imbalance, where the pendulum does not swing too far to either side and funds to manage and conserve this unique world heritage will be proudly created within the country by its own people! It's a win-win situation for all – even for the elephant!

Where do we go from here? It is certainly not enough to write essays and articles. The next logical step would be the contracting of an extensive and comprehensive feasibility study of the massive task to cull and utilize between 6 000 and 10 000 elephant a year (remember – this will just stabilize and not reduce the existing elephant population in Botswana)! I am convinced that the outcome will support what I said.

In the 21st century human populations have occupied every conceivable niche on our planet at the expense of other life forms. We have "achieved" that pristine areas and eco-

Continued on Page 8

7 Tannin poisoning of game animals

Dr Lourens Havenga (BVSc) reviews the toxic effects of plant produced tannins on wild game in an interesting article in the Newsletter 7/1 of the Wildlife Group of the South African Veterinary Association.

The production of tannins as a defence mechanism by plants has been researched and proven. As more and more game farms were fenced off during the past 20 – 30 years, the true economic impact of tannin poisoning on game became evident. In his review, Dr Havenga explains research results and explores why animals die of tannin poisoning and suggests methods which can reduce the effects of tannin toxicity on game. Tannin toxicity manifests itself either as protein malabsorption or in simpler terms as emaciation, i.e. the animals eventually die of malnutrition, or as acute deaths, i.e. apparently healthy animals die of liver and kidney failures.

Several studies have proven that giraffe, greater kudu, eland, duiker, impala and nyala do not possess any rumen microbes that can digest or inactivate tannins. Most browsers, browse selectively, selecting plants which contain less than 5% (dried leaf mass) condensed tannin. The defence mechanism of the affected plants kicks in with tannin production within 2 - 10 minutes after onset of browsing (hence animals move from tree to tree, never browsing one tree totally). Recovery to pre-disturbed levels takes 40 – 66 hours. This explains why browsers, even if they keep to the same area, are rarely found at the exact location day after day; this is contrary to the situation with many grazers. It is clear that by concentrating browsers and forcing them to constantly browse the same plants, the threshold of salivary tannin binding is exceeded and either acute deaths or chronic emaciation will occur.

There are basically only two practical ways of dealing with tannin related problems:

- Decrease the stocking rate of browsers (within species and also among species), and
- supply polyethylene glycol (Browse Plus) via drinking water,

For more information on the use of Browse Plus, phone Virbac Animal Health on 012 – 657 6000. If you are interested in reading the complete article of Dr Havenga please contact the editor of the Wildlife Group Newsletter vetnews@sava.co.za

AI

African Chapter – African Indaba Newsletter

Editor: Gerhard R Damm, Postal Address: PO Box 411, Rivonia 2128, RSA, Email: gerhard@muskwa.co.za P +27-11-883-2299, F +27-11-784-2074,

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

African Chapter Executive Committee

President: Gerhard R Damm, Vice-President: Willem Lombaard, Treasurer: Richard Henry, Secretary: Thomas Ochsenbein, Committee: Dieter Ochsenbein, Katharina Hecker, Trevor Shaw
Bank: Nedbank Parktown Branch, Account # 1944-149619
Auditor: Spencer Steward (Johannesburg) Inc

Continued from Page 7

4 Culling Elephant in Botswana

systems are surrounded by a growing sea of humanity. Although we see and regret our past errors, we cannot turn back the clock of evolution, but we can influence its future speed and course. Influence, however, means management. Those who oppose the use of human intelligence and science for the sustainable management of natural resources, of which the elephant of Botswana are just one, will be responsible for the eventual disappearance of the priceless biodiversity of northern Botswana. We must not permit that to happen.

It is late, but not too late yet! The Department of Wildlife and National Parks is scheduled to release its draft elephant management policy in June. The final policy is due to be submitted to the Botswana government for consideration at the end of July.

AI

8 Game ranch profitability in Southern Africa

The ABSA (Amalgamated Banks of South Africa) Group Economic Research Unit authored this in-depth analysis. The 41 page paper's contents are of considerable interest to the hunting and game ranching community not only in South Africa, but throughout the SADAC region. The exhaustive text is complemented by numerous tables and statistics. As the title states, the ABSA team concentrated on the economic side of game ranching, but takes position also with regards to ethics particular to this field and in hunting. The high professional standard makes "Game Ranch Profitability in Southern Africa" a MUST READ for all people who have an active interest in this field. Extracts from the contents:

- The trend towards game ranching in southern Africa
- Upfront Cost of game ranches
- Current income and expenditure of game ranches
- Specific infrastructure expenses for eco-tourism
- Profitability trends in game ranching
- Profit drivers of game ranching
- Conservancies
- Game farm profitability
- Game management and business ethics

The concluding remark is worth noting: "As Aristotle emphasized, one cannot speak of morality to someone who is devoid of all moral sense. It is simply a waste of time. But for those who understand what is at stake, virtue has its advantages because it is regarded as one of the highest forms of individual pleasure and therefore of happiness. Similarly, not all game ranchers may see the commercial benefits of a proper code of conduct for the wildlife industry, but for those who understand the benefits of virtue, such a code may seem an absolute necessity". (*Editor's comment: Lion breeders and put & take operators beware!*)

The text can be downloaded from ABSA's website (<http://www.absa.co.za/>) as pdf-file. Go to the ABSA Library page, click Sectoral Economic Analysis and go to http://www.absa.co.za/Abas_Library/0,2999,2000,00.html

Click on Game Ranch Profitability.

AI

9 AWF Carnivore project launched in Botswana

The African Wildlife Foundation has recently launched a project studying large carnivores. AWF-staffer Gosiamé Neo-Mahupeleng, a native of northern Botswana will focus his research in Chobe National Park in northeastern Botswana and in the eastern Caprivi area of Namibia. This project was created with the support of the Behrman family who donated funds in memory of Darryl Behrman.

The land use system in Chobe National Park, the first established park in Botswana, differs significantly from the Caprivi in Namibia. Chobe National Park is a protected area while the Caprivi is a subsistence and mixed agriculture area. The two are divided by the Chobe River. The project has been extended into Namibia because predators have been found disrupting cattle ranching on Namibian farms and damaging crops and property. The goal of Gosiamé's research is to conserve the predator populations in their natural state. The project concentrates on lions and spotted hyenas and focuses on distribution - past and present (mainly in Caprivi)-movements of prides, packs and individuals, habitat preferences, demography-population size, age and sex structure, and economic impact on livestock. Materials used for research are questionnaires, radio telemetry, spoor counts, calling stations and individual "follows". The density of lions within Chobe National Park has been calculated at 37 individuals per 100 square kilometers. This density is as high as the density in the Ngorongoro Crater! There are 30 adult females and three adult males that rule a targeted area along the Zambezi waterfront in Chobe. These lions are therefore very important to waterfront ecology and also tourism in the park.

Four main prides of lions have claimed territory by the river in a hunting zone. Problems created by competition for prey between these groups rarely exists during the dry season because all wildlife comes to the river for water and with abundant food each lion pride can appropriately distance themselves from each other. However, during the wet season, prey is more dispersed which makes hunting more difficult. Therefore, there is more competition causing lion territories to overlap.

Previous studies conducted by Gosiamé, which used satellite imagery and VHF radio collars, discovered that lions prefer to reside in areas along the river where the older trees have been damaged by elephants passing thus converting the landscape to shrub land. The smaller broken trees allow lions to hide and easily maneuver their way through the brush to capture prey. Studies have shown that the average male dominates a pride and a territory for two to three years. At the Chobe waterfront, two male lions, who are unrelated, have dominated for the last six years and the whole population is now related to the two males. Gosiamé has posed a few questions concerning these two male lions: Have they become successful due to the strength they have gained from good hunting, enabling them to fight off other competitors? Or, are human impacts on the landscape making it difficult for young adult males to arrive at the Chobe waterfront to continue breeding and roaming their new territory?

Gosiamé and his team of researchers look at lion genetics

by shooting tipped veterinary darts that take a piece of tissue then fall away from the lion. DNA tests have been conducted and show that there is a high amount of interbreeding within the population, such as, nephews with aunts and fathers with daughters. Gosiamé states that genetic diversity is important to sustain a healthy population and the gene pool of this lion population could be in jeopardy. But, no one really knows to what extent this could be abnormal.

The ecological data gathered will serve as a baseline to determine the effects of management and conflict on distribution, social behavior and population structure of key predators. By achieving this, AWF can ensure the survival of healthy predators through adapted management practices, and the positive and negative relationships between predators, humans, and livestock will be better understood.

Source: AWF Website: <http://www.awf.org> (reprinted with the kind permission of AWF) – browse the AWF website for interesting information about the work of the African Wildlife Foundation **AI**

10 How do geckos stick to walls?

Geckos, to put it simply, have truly amazing feet. Humans have been trying to get to the bottom of gecko feet for centuries. Why? Because geckos can skitter across any surface, horizontal or vertical, right-side up or upside down, be it a rock, a plaster wall, a tree branch, a leaf, or a pane of glass, without falling off. They stick so well that they can even hang by a single toe, if so inclined.

Theories about gecko stickiness have abounded over the years. It was thought that their toes acted like suction cups, that there was chemical bonding involved, that the adhesive attraction had to do with water molecules. Recently, scientists have finally discovered just what it is that makes a gecko stick. On the bottom of each gecko toe pad are scales covered with a myriad of microscopic hair like bristles, millions of them. Each tiny bristle is in turn covered with about a thousand minute pads — and we mean minute: each pad is said to be only 200 billionths of a metre wide. These pads are just the right size and shape to bond at the molecular level with molecules on the surface material. The force of attraction at work is called van der Waals forces. Now that scientists have discovered the key to this miraculous adhesive, they have been developing synthetic “gecko feet” in order to study its properties and explore possible applications. Eventually they hope to invent an adhesive that can be used far and wide, wet and dry, everywhere from under water to outer space.

Courtesy of Hoo-Hoo – the Newsletter of the Wildlife Group of the South African Veterinary Association Vol. 7/#1. For more details about the Wildlife Group contact: netnews@sava.co.za **AI**

To receive an email with a PDF or Word file of the article “Hunters and Conservationists – Natural Allies!” as published by “Africa Geographic” Volume 11, Number 1 please mail G. Damm gerhard@muskwa.co.za and indicate format preference.

11 Africa's most endangered duiker lives in Zanzibar

By Dr. Rolf D. Baldus

The United Republic of Tanzania has Africa's highest mountain, largest game reserve ... and rarest duiker. The latter is nothing to be proud of. We speak of the Zanzibar or Aders' duiker, a small antelope of the duiker family, weighing 6 to 12 kg and standing about 70 cm in height at the shoulder. The body colour is a light reddish-brown. The head has a bushy tuft of hair surrounding the horns. Both sexes have little horns, but those of the males are bigger, measuring about 5 cm.

The small antelope once was common at many places in Zanzibar. In a survey, Swai counted in 1983 approximately 5,000 Aders' duiker on the island. In 1999 the number was down to 600 animals. Nowadays, it is restricted to a few forests along the east coast of Zanzibar. All are unprotected except the Jozani forest where less than 10% of the duikers occur. Today their number could well be under 300 animals.

It is difficult to reach a conclusion about the size of a duiker population, as one cannot easily count them. The methods used are sample counts at night with torches, catching them in nets in sample areas or dung counts and then projecting their number over their whole range.

The Aders' duiker also occurs in the Arabuko-Sokoke forest in Kilifi District in Kenya. It is safe to say that both populations together count less than a thousand animals. It is amazing that the same sub-species occurs on the Kenyan coast, but not along the Tanzanian coast opposite Zanzibar. Red duikers are very common there, but they seem to be the normal Natal Red or Harvey's duiker according to DNA-analysis. However, it is still too early for conclusions, as our research is still ongoing.

Now the reader might be interested to see this animal, being one of the rarest in the world and living on our doorsteps. The best advice I can give is to do the same as the scientists normally do when they want to study this duiker: Go on one of the markets in Zanzibar and look at duiker carcasses which might be for sale and which will end up as stew or mishkake (*something like an East African soesatie or kebab – editor*). The reason for the 90% population decline in two decades is killing the duikers for their meat. They are caught in nets together with the blue duiker and the little suni antelope, which share the forests and thickets with them. They are shot at night with shotguns in the light of torches. It is mainly traditional hunters from the villages nearby who conduct these hunts on their own or who join together in large driven hunts. Sometimes dogs are used too. There are also people from Zanzibar town who come by car on weekends, shoot the odd duiker at night and afterwards enjoy a barbecue on the beach. Some years ago it was reported that such honorable sportsmen killed about thirty duikers during just one weekend.

All efforts in the past to stop this bush meat hunting have failed although it is against the law. Asking the duiker experts does not help either, as they mainly propagate educating the people and outlawing hunting for bush meat. But the hunters in Zanzibar know that the duikers are vanishing, and that hunting them has been illegal for decades. A handful of duikers were translocated to Chumbe Island near Zanzibar town. This is a small privately run eco-resort, and the little animals are safe there.

In the near future the world's leading experts on small antelopes will gather for a conference on Chumbe. Many bright papers will be presented, the demise of the Aders' duiker will be deplored, and the researchers will return to their study rooms afterwards.

It looks as if the extermination of this animal is only a matter of time – quite obscene if one considers that the present meat value of the remaining duikers is probably not much more than 2.500 US\$. However, without giving these animals a value, which can be turned into money without exterminating them, they certainly will not be saved from extinction.

Wildlife conservation on the island is solely the responsibility of the Government of Zanzibar. There might be hope, if somebody could convince the Government to take the issue seriously.

The Zanzibar duiker is part of the National Heritage as much as is the world-famous Stone Town. Upon a constructive stand of the Zanzibar Government, a programme to involve the communities into the conservation of the duiker could be started. The Tanzanian policy, to create Wildlife Management Areas in which the communities manage their game, conserve and use it for their own benefit, could serve as a model.

This policy is applied on the mainland – why not in Zanzibar?

AI

The Basis for Hunting is Conservation

- Hunters harvest species which permit sustainable use
- Hunters strive for wildlife and habitat equilibrium
- Hunters accept responsibility for non-game animals
- Hunters are actively engaged in the conservation and the protection of species

Hunters Observe a Code of Ethics

- Hunters respect the rules of fair chase
- Hunters respect and obey all laws
- Hunters set high ethical parameters and strive for excellence in the field
- Hunters ensure humane wildlife harvesting practices
- Hunters constantly hone their skills

Hunters & Hunting Project a Positive Image

- Hunters are reliable and competent partners to the public and conservation organizations
- Hunters respect the needs and requirements of others for enjoyment of nature
- Hunters cooperate with indigenous communities supporting their right to the sustainable use of nature
- Hunters inform the public and the media of their objectives, about problems, solutions and achievements

12 News from Africa

South Africa

A black rhino had to be shot dead on May 6th when it attacked a group of tourists in KwaZulu-Natal's Hluhluwe-Imfolozi Park. A spokesman for Ezemvelo KZN Wildlife said two brothers were injured. They were part of a group led by two armed rangers and were walking along a game path near the White Mfolozi River when the rhino attacked, ignoring shouts and warning shots fired by the rangers. The animal knocked down three trailists. When a fourth person broke cover and the rhino charged him, a ranger fired a shot killing the animal.

Ezemvelo KZN Wildlife staff went to the scene the next day and found that the black rhino was a known bull way out of his territory. There were serious horn wounds around its scrotum indicating that it had been in a fight and had probably been displaced from its territory by a younger male.

Botswana

The government of Botswana says operators close to water sources are wanting in their commitment to the environment. The Department of Water Affairs undertook a pollution monitoring study and found that operators are cutting corners and ignoring environmental and health concerns in a quest to maximize profit. The report found that some lodges along the Okavango Delta, Kwando, Linyanti and Chobe rivers are threatening to pollute and contaminate underground and surface water, as well as disturbing the delicate eco-system in the wetlands.

Some findings were that 86 of the lodges use septic tanks with soak-aways, 22 use pit latrines and only four are connected to the water borne sewage reticulation. Only 15% use fat traps. In some cases, pipes are used to dispose the raw waste directly into the open environment.

At least 80 lodges are situated within flood plains and have the highest potential for pollution. The report also found that most lodges are located about 25 metres from river banks, thus eliminating any buffer zone. (Source: Travel News Now, Miguel de Sousa)

Tanzania

Tanzanian wildlife researchers are working around the clock to unravel a mystery venereal disease that has hit olive baboons at Manyara National Park. Male baboons in the park are reported to be dying after contracting the as yet unidentified disease. Experts have flown to the park to set up field laboratories and identify possible cause for the disease.

Tanzanian authorities have confirmed that over 200 baboons are reported to have contracted the mystery disease, which attack's the monkey's reproductive organs. Conservation officials are not yet sure whether the disease is sexually transmitted, although local rangers and park employees are describing the disease as syphilis.

Zambia

According to Zambia Wildlife Authority (Zawa) local communities will now retain 45% of consumptive and non-consumptive tourism revenue. ZAWA director general Hapenga Kabeta said the measure had been adopted as an effective

way of wildlife management with local people playing a central role and deriving maximum benefits from tourism activities in their areas. Mr Kabeta stated that government and the host traditional ruler were entitled to 10% and 5% respectively while ZAWA had a 40% share from the revenues generated.

The ZAWA developed framework of regulations also includes appropriate clauses to ensure that safari-hunting concessionaires deliver on undertakings made in hunting concession agreements. These undertakings mainly address issues of poverty eradication through building of schools, clinics and roads, etc. It will ensure that communities receive their allocations of fees by the safari-hunting outfitters.

Mr Kabeta pointed out that past attempts at conservation of nature failed as locals felt alienated from the management of the resource resulting in poaching and a massive abuse of the resources by outsiders. The 1998 legislation review, to ensure participation of locals and sharing of associated costs and benefits presents a solution through the sustainable utilization of natural resources, local participation and proper regulatory framework. The ZAWA chief executive also highlighted that the concept of ethno-tourism as an attempt to restore and promote the human dignity of the African people will have a direct positive on the lives of the poor.

Zimbabwe

Six safari companies are under investigation by the Zimbabwe Revenue Authority for allegedly repatriating foreign currency and failing to declare trophies worth more than Z\$6 billion. According to the intelligence unit of National Economic Consultative Forum set up to investigate operations of safari operators and professional hunters, six companies were being investigated by ZIMRA and the National Parks and Wildlife Management Authority. A NECF spokesman said the NECF was concerned at the plunder of the country's natural resources and will continue to investigate anomalies in the big game hunting industry. Three of the companies under investigations are in Matabeleland North, and one each in Matabeleland South, Mashonaland West and Manicaland provinces.

The hunting business is one of the most lucrative in the Zimbabwe tourism industry earning millions in foreign currency each hunting season.

Tanzania

The Mweka College of African Wildlife Management situated at the foot of the Kilimanjaro near Moshi turned 40. Shortly after gaining independence, the foresight of Dr Julius Nyerere, Tanzania's first president, and Major Bruce Kinloch, former chief game warden, led to the inauguration of the first specialized training college for wildlife managers in Africa in June 1963. Anno Hecker, the father of well-known South African taxidermist and African Chapter member, Katharina Hecker, taught for many years at the Mweka College. In its important function, Mweka College trains specialists from national parks, game reserves and hunting concessions in one-year certificate courses, two-year diploma courses and three-year advanced diploma courses in Wildlife Management and also gives specialized short term training of all kind in the

Continued on Page 12

Continued from Page 11
12 News from Africa

environmental and tourism fields. In adaptation to new challenges and changing policies, the staff has responded and now new topics are also covered like for example the whole range of Community Based Natural Resources Management.

Tanzania's vice-president presided over the birthday celebrations on June 14th and took the opportunity to express his and his country's gratitude to all supporters of the College. Following its motto "We Hold it in Trust" the College has greatly supported and influenced wildlife management in Africa over the years. Most of the present staff in wildlife institutions in many parts of Africa are ex-Mweka. "We are proud of that", said Deogratias Gamassa, the College Principal, to **African Indaba**.

Namibia

The Namibian Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET) has sent a team of officials to investigate the conditions under which 3 lions are kept in captivity at the IntuAfrica Lodge near Mariental after foreign tourists reported the lions killing a donkey in what they considered a staged "kill". While on a game drive, the tourists were driven into a 500 hectare enclosure, where they saw almost no game, but were told that 3 lions were kept. They observed a donkey that appeared to be domesticated and was eventually stalked, killed and eaten by the lions. One of the tourists who witnessed the incident said "there can be little doubt, in my view, that the donkey had been introduced to the enclosure for the purpose of feeding the lions". He noted that their guide began to drive the donkey towards the lioness, saying: "Go on donkey, do your job." IntuAfrica Managing Director Howard Hebbard said the lions were being kept for rehabilitation purposes and that they were being taught to hunt and kill before being released into the wild. He claimed that feeding donkeys to the young lions was perfectly acceptable considering their abundance in the area and the expenses involved in obtaining large game for the lions to feed on.

South Africa

Our congratulations go to the **Professional Hunters' Association of South Africa (PHASA)** and all members of PHASA. A dream came true, when PHASA offices were moved from rented premises in Centurion to the PHASA building in Irene beginning of June. The PHASA team will no doubt be even more effective from the new installations.

Please take note of the new PHASA contact numbers. Telephone national 012-667-2048, international +27-12-667-2048, Fax national 012-667-2049, international +27-12-667-2049, email phasa@pixie.co.za. The postal address remains the same at PO Box 10264, Centurion 0046, South Africa.

South Africa

PHASA has published the 2nd edition of the **South African Hunting Guide in 2003**. The revamped 88 page magazine serves to inform hunters about the abundance of hunting opportunities in South Africa and the PHASA members offering professional hunting and outfitting services, about tourist attraction South Africa has to offer, and generally contains a host of useful information. Efforts are on the way al-

ready to make the 2004 PHASA South African Hunting Guide an even better publication.

If you want to secure your copy of the 2003 PHASA guide, or if you want to advertise in the 2004 guide, please contact Paula McGehee at the PHASA offices under email phasa@pixie.co.za, phone +27-12-667-2048

Angola/Finland

During the 50th General Assembly in May 2003 in Helsinki/Finland the **International Council for Game and Wildlife Conservation (CIC)** adopted a resolution saying "that due to the civil war the Giant Sable Antelope (*Hippotragus niger variani*) is a critically endangered CITES Appendix I species and remains only in the Malange province of Angola. The International Council for Game and Wildlife Conservation condemns any form of marketing of, or attempt to hunt this endangered species and encourages all measures to support their protection. (*Editor's comment: Readers may remember that a "Giant Sable Hunt" has been offered by a South African outfitter. We strongly opposed this irresponsible action and recommend that other hunting organizations follow the lead of CIC in ostracizing those who offer and those who take the offer – and this does not only apply to Giant Sable but to any legally protected animal*)

Botswana

Mr. Moremi M Tjibae is the new warden of the Khama Rhino Sanctuary. Moremi holds a diploma in Wildlife Management from the Mweka College in Tanzania and a B.Sc degree in wildlife ecology from the University of Botswana. During a recent visit at the Sanctuary Moremi was introduced to the African Chapter Environmental Education Program. The textbook and the poster will be used in future course at the new environmental education center (EEC), which is located 28km northwest of Serowe on the Orapa road.

Zimbabwe

African Indaba has received disturbing information about certain South African Professional hunters and South African sport hunters who are shamelessly using the turmoil in Zimbabwe to conduct illegal hunts or participate in what can only be described as poaching. Beginning of June, 2 South African PHs with 3 American clients and a black Zimbabwean PH where caught on a Gwaai area property. The PH was apprehended by police. Reportedly the South Africans and their clients escaped. In the Matabeleland South area 3 South Africans in a GP registered vehicle poached 3 zebra, an impala and a rhino. The rhino horn was removed.

AI

13 Northern Cape moves ahead with a bold step

Congratulations to the Northern Cape Department of Agriculture, Land Reform, Environment and Conservation for initiating a program on the training of previously disadvantaged persons as professional hunters. Trainees were selected from 5 different rural communities and 12 hand-picked individuals attended a course at Sutherland Professional Hunting Academy.

Continued on Page 13

Continued from Page 12

13 Northern Cape moves ahead with bold step

Northern Cape MEC David Rooi, presented the participants with their hard-earned certificates on March 19th. PHASA was represented by PHASA CED Gary Davies and PHASA President Dieter Ochsenbein. With the full backing and cooperation of PHASA, the Northern Cape Department will start a Skills Development and Empowerment Program to give these new professional hunters the basis to become fully fledged outfitters. The provincial government allocated R2-million for a three-year period, to ensure the program's success.

In April, MEC Rooi delivered to the Schmidtsdrift and Platfontein communities' two communal wildlife ranches and ushered in a new era giving wildlife ownership to rural people through sustainable-use projects. A total of 12 different species have been earmarked for the two ranches. The provincial department will be transferring game from its reserves to make these ranches self-sustainable. Speaking at the handing over ceremony, Mr Rooi said "The necessary results have been attained - we're moving in the right direction at the right speed. We hope to bid 2003 farewell with a total of 30 previously disadvantaged professional hunters. Through these efforts we shall not fail in creating real defenders of wildlife and not a constituency-less minority of wildlife fanatics who keep on endangering the South African economy by calling for a tourism boycott against trophy hunting."

Editor's Comment: Well done, Mr Rooi – you and your colleagues have our full support. This is an exemplary way forward!

AI

14 WCS uses food security to conserve Zambia's wildlife

There is a direct link between illegal killing of wildlife and food security. This is especially true during the months between December and March when rural communities are preparing their fields and waiting for harvest. This food shortage forces households to turn to the wildlife resource for relief. Unless this question of food security is addressed, the decimation of wildlife will continue among communities. But new ideas are coming from certain conservation organizations. The Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS) has invested US \$ 150,000 in developing Conservation Farmer Wildlife Producer Trading Centers (CTCs) in Luangwa valley. WCS-Zambia Branch Country Director Dale Lewis says the idea is a new initiative to reduce poaching and threats to wildlife in the valley.

The program was designed after a survey was conducted at household level in Luangwa valley. The study revealed that high numbers of animals were being lost through illegal killing and snaring by the local people. According to Lewis, snaring is particularly wasteful, because it can indiscriminately kill all species, many of which are not used as food. Lewis says with looming hunger in the country, there is need for community initiatives that will cushion the impact of hunger on wildlife. "This keeps rural communities focused on legal markets that do not contribute to conflicts with wildlife production," says

Lewis. The Regional Trading Centers link rural households with legal markets for goods that people can locally produce.

The concept of Conservation Trading Centers (CTCs) is already operational in Lundazi, a rural district in eastern province. Two other regional centers are being planned. The key principle behind the CTCs is that communities living with wildlife will have access to new legal and more profitable markets. Community groups are encouraged to register with a CTC, so that they refrain from practices that threaten wildlife. Lewis said, so far, 362 farmers groups, representing a total population of 30 000 local people, had been formed in Luangwa valley. The CTC also coordinates inputs delivery to producer groups, either on cash or barter-system. To help promote success of the CTCs, groups are equipped with training skills in marketing, accounting and business management. WCS reports that hunger affecting 15 000 households in the valley, has led to rampant poaching. "Illegal hunting is directly related to hunger. It is because people have no alternatives", said Lewis. After a two year pilot scheme in Luangwa valley WCS, in partnership with the World Food Program (WFP), developed a strategy of using food relief to mobilize families for wildlife conservation. Lewis says the objective of the project is for the local people to adopt improved farming methods as a basis for reducing threats to wildlife. "Results were spectacular," says Lewis.

According to WCS, during pilot scheme period, over 10,000 wire snares used to illegally kill wildlife were voluntarily surrendered by community members. "This represented an annual saving of over 2000 wild animals," said Lewis. In economic terms, this saving has the potential to help generate over US \$ 400,000 from safari hunting and photo tourism.

With the help of traditional rulers in the valley, WCS identified 35 local poachers. The poachers were then engaged as students to learn new livelihood skills. This was done through the African College for Community-Based Natural Resources Management (CBNRM) in South Luangwa. The hunters voluntarily laid down their firearms and adopted alternative livelihoods.

According to Lewis, in each case, WCS supported the process with agro-inputs and small loans to enable hunters earn income. As defined by the Wildlife act of 1998, WCS seek to continue the work of transforming poachers by linking the process to communities' authorities. WCS is looking into ways of continuing offering amnesty to illegal hunters. Approximately US \$ 25 000 has been earmarked for the exercise, to transform 50 more poachers. Available information indicates that it would cost five times this amount to arrest and prosecute the same number of poachers. (Source: WCS)

For more information about the Wildlife Conservation Society visit their website at <http://wcs.org/> and their African Projects at <http://wcs.org/home/wild/Africa>

AI

WE ARE LOOKING FOR A CORPORATE SPONSOR TO PRINT AND MAIL 500 AFRICAN INDABA SIX TIMES A YEAR. ARE YOU INTERESTED?

Contact gerhard@muskwa.co.za

**CONTACT INFORMATION
HUNTING ASSOCIATIONS IN AFRICA**

Confederation of Hunting Associations of SA (CHASA), PO Box 184, Bethal 2310, RSA, phone: 017-647-5882, fax: 017-647-4057 **Consult CHASA for a listing of affiliated South African sport hunting associations and contact these associations directly for membership information.**

Professional Hunters' Association of South Africa (PHASA), PO Box 10264, Centurion 0046, RSA, phone 012-667-2048, fax 012-667-2049, phasa@pixie.co.za, www.professionallhunters.co.za

Eastern Cape Game Management Association (ECGMA), POB 1344, Uitenhage 6230, RSA, phone & fax 041-922-7618, ecgma@global.co.za www.ecgma.co.za

African Professional Hunters' Association (APHA), PO Box 24919, Nairobi, Kenya, phone 254-2-891809, ravn@swiftkenya.com

Botswana Wildlife Management Association (BWMA), Private Bag 095, Maun, Botswana, phone 267-686 2673, trophy@info.bw

Namibian Professional Hunter's Association (NAPHA), PO Box 11291 Windhoek, Namibia, phone 264-61-234455, napha@natron.net www.natron.net/napha

Zimbabwe Professional Hunters and Guides Association (ZPHGA), P.O. Box 7240, Harare, Zimbabwe, p 263-4-708878, pangeti@zct.co.zw

Tanzania Professional Hunters' Association (TZPHA), PO Box 3483, Dar Es Salaam, Tanzania, p 255-22-26666174 tzpha@hotmail.com

Professional Hunters' Association of Zambia (PHAZ) Postnet 184, Pte. Bag E835, Lusaka, Zambia, p: 260-1-251-946, suedale@zamnet.zm

SA Wingshooters Association, PO Box 11022, Maroelana 0161, admin@wingshooters.co.za www.wingshooters.co.za

If your association is not included, or if address details have changed, please contact African Indaba, gerhard@muskwa.co.za

We need your assistance!

In order to reach a broader public we urge all who receive African Indaba by email to distribute the newsletter to friends and interested persons.

Any organization and/or individual who maintain a website can make African Indaba accessible to browsers and users by appending it as pdf file to the site.

Webmasters – please inform us, in case you are using African Indaba.

If you use individual articles in printed or electronic form, please give proper recognition to African Indaba and the authors.

15 Shady deals in Zimbabwean concession allocations

(Editorial comment: The allocation of hunting concessions in Zimbabwe goes from bad to worse. It seems that more and more people who do not have hunting and conservation at their heart get allocated with concessions. What this will mean to the once flourishing safari industry in Zimbabwe is anybody's guess. African Indaba urges all international hunters to closely monitor the situation and refrain from hunting with certain outfitters/operators).

The Zimbabwean Ministry of Environment and Tourism disregarded tender procedures by directing Parks and Wildlife Management Authority (PWMA) to issue 2 additional hunting concessions without following proper procedures. If the ministry's directive goes unchallenged it may result in PWMA authority being shortchanged of millions of Zimbabwean dollars. In an unprecedented move, Zimbabwean Environment and Tourism Minister Francis Nhema directed the authority to award hunting concessions in the Deka Pool and Sengwa Safari area to the companies Aristoc and Tentpeg **FOR FREE**, although other bidders were prepared to fork out between US\$1 million and US\$2 million (Z\$824 million and Z\$1.6 billion at the official exchange rate). At this stage, **African Indaba** could not establish the owners of Aristoc and Tentpeg, although rumors persist that the two companies are owned by former diplomats. Senior officials within his ministry said the directive was meant to ensure that the concessions fall in the hands of people who have not been economically empowered before.

Initially PWMA wanted to market the concessions through public auction hoping in order to better the 2003 result of Z\$585 million from the sale of one concession. However, it was reported that Mothobi directed a confidential circular dated June 2 2003 to PWMA board members, insinuating that that the minister's directive was meant to accelerate the pace of economic empowerment. He said the directive was also in line with the National Economic Revival Program adopted by the government in February and that he, Mothobi, "complied with the minister's directive on behalf of the board and the authority".

It seems, however, that board members of PWMA are of split opinion over the issue. It is also noteworthy that prior auctions of PWMA have already stirred controversy about procedures and those who were awarded with concessions.

The controversy includes the Charara, Makuti, Doma and Tuli concessions which, up to 2002 were reserved for citizen hunters. In 2002 they were allocated - donated - to 4 indigenous operators on an "experimental 1 year lease. We have learned that these areas generated more money under citizen hunters than they did from foreign clients under their present lessees - partly because part of the foreign currency earned was expatriated in contravention of Zimbabwean law. Tuli is allocated to minister Nhema's sister-in-law - and Makuti to one Manuel Fundirwa - allegedly a front man for Nhema.

In a previous incident, the Matetsi Unit 1 lease was a bone of contention between Matetsi Wildlife Safaris partners Ed Kazombe and Charles Davey. It appears that both – Kazombe representing Matetsi Wildlife Safaris and Davey with his management company HHK Safaris – marketed the same quota during the 2003 convention circuit. **AI**

16 Chaos in the Kenya Wildlife Service

By Hubert Waeller

Chaos reigns at KWS! The Kenyan environment minister Newton Kulundu has relieved the director of the Kenyan Wildlife Service from his position and appointed Dr John Waithaka as successor. Michal Wamithi, the former director, was appointed to the job only in November 2003. However, the “Kenya Wildlife Service” (KWS) enjoys a certain autonomy as parastatal entity, and does not function anymore as department within the ministry. Control over KWS lies in the hands of a governing board. This board has promptly declared that Wamithi’s sacking to be illegal. Kulundu explained the reasons for sacking Wamithi and stated financial mismanagement, contravening government instructions and acting against the interests of the Kenyan Government.

Wamithi had been appointed shortly before last year’s general election by the old government of Arap Moi and the former KWS director Dr Richard Leakey is reported to have actively recommended Wamithi’s appointment. Wamithi is a known animal rightist and a declared adversary of hunting. Prior to his appointment in KWS, Wamithi occupied the position as regional director of the International Fund for Animal Welfare (IFAW). Kulundu accused Leakey of working in cahoots with Wamithi, interfering in KWS and undermining the Government efforts in wildlife conservation.

For quite some time, Leakey is trying to raise the astonishing amount of \$400 million, to finance conservation or rather protectionism in East Africa, in particular in Kenya. This incredible amount should serve – if Leakey has his way – to prevent a come-back of sport hunting in Kenya. Uganda’s government has obviously fallen prey already to the lure of the dollar millions. Government representatives of Tanzania, however have declared – at a recent fund conference in Nativasha – serious doubts, and negated an interest of their government in the fund. Tanzania considers hunting an important economic factor and one of the pillars to finance game management and conservation. Uganda has – just like Kenya – outlawed sport hunting decades ago. Two years ago Uganda’s government relented and started a pilot project for trophy hunting. Last year the government ordered a review of the pilot project. This review was financed by IFAW, who are openly opposed to hunting.

The World Bank and the Global Environment Facility (GEF) are rumoured to be the major donors for Leakey’s ambitious plans. It is noteworthy that both are international organizations, which are financed by contributions of sovereign states, i. e. through tax money collected in Europe and North America. Leakey is also looking for private donors. The financially strong American animal rights organizations have already indicated their interest to participate in the fund. They are recognizing that this would give them far-reaching possibilities to influence conservation policies in East Africa.

Leakey’s chances to succeed are not bad at all, since the media-savvy ex-politician enjoys the status of a cult figure in North America. Leakey is, however, known in Africa as political turncoat. He once assumed a candidacy for the Kenyan opposition, but returned to Arap Moi’s government after the

elections – with a government position worth \$20 000 per month being his reward. His present professionally managed PR campaign and preparatory work for the establishment of the fund are financed by the American government with \$100 000 and the Ford Foundation contributed \$50 000 for a feasibility study. The first documents of the fund named Leakey as manager with the princely monthly salary of \$25 000. In the meantime, nobody wants to know anything about this fact. Richard Wackmann, the former Kenya Director of the World Bank is reported to be the second driving force behind the fund – and is rumoured to eventually obtain a job in the board.

Former IFAW representative and KWS director Wamithi participated earlier this year in conferences regarding the fund without having had government authorization. To this end, Wamithi, Leakey and others travelled at more than one occasion in planes and helicopters of KWS; it is said that two of the trips went to Uganda, without proper authorization and – more importantly – without payment. It is quite amusing that Leakey himself seems to have given instruction for the use of the parastatal aircraft. It was also learned that KWS gave IFAW preferential conditions for the use of KWF aircraft.

Minister Kulundu accused the former KWS board of corruption. Additionally, Kulundu criticized Leakey, who already had the position as KWS director twice during the nineties, that Leakey’s policies prevent the poor rural communities living around the Kenyan national parks of any use of their natural treasures, although they have to suffer all the related consequences and damages. It is a fact that these communities have repeatedly asked for re-introduction of sport hunting and sustainable consumptive and non-consumptive use. Leakey brushed all arguments aside – one of his arguments being that the people living around a power station do not get cheaper electricity neither.

One fact is clear, however: Leakey tenure as KWS chief did nothing to make the agency financially independent, neither did it result in proper governance. Wildlife numbers continued to shrink and the only success was a significant reduction in elephant poaching. Neither the rural communities nor the large land owners are allowed to sustainably use their animal treasures. Therefore they are not interested in protecting “their” wildlife.

“Leakey may be a star in America – in Kenya, Leakey did more damage to wildlife than all elephant poachers put together” ... these were the words of a farmer in Nairobi... **AI**

VIDEO “The African Game”

“The African Game” is a hard hitting 3 hour video that examines the confrontation between wildlife politics and wildlife conservation. It addresses the negative effects of emotional anti-use campaigns and the successes achieved by African game managers. The complete set is available from the African Chapter for R200.00 (add postage for addresses outside RSA)

You can also order direct from Oracle Television Productions. Check their website

<http://www.oracletvproductions.com/>.

For a description of the video and ordering instructions

17 Events

GIS Applications & Environmental Management Short Course 25 – 31 August 2003

The use of Geographical Information Systems (GIS) in environmental sciences and wildlife management has continued to become more and more popular. The ability of the GIS allows for the integration of data and information from a variety of resources. From regional environmental landscape description, to detailed protected areas management the GIS have successfully added a spatial dimension to the decision-making processes. This course is intended to reach individuals who are involved directly or indirectly with the management of a protected area. These may be students who currently attend the Southern African Wildlife College (SAWC), those that currently hold positions in Governmental and/or Private Protected Areas. Additionally the course will allow for the accommodation of University graduate students in the wildlife/nature conservation disciplines. The students will have obtained the following once the course has been completed:

- a) Introduction to GIS
- b) Introduction to Remote Sensing
- c) Introduction to the use of GPS
- d) Integration of the above disciplines
- e) Hands-on use of GIS Software
- f) Hand-on use of GPS handheld units
- g) Spatial & Attribute Database Design

For more details please contact Adam Pires at the **Southern African Wildlife College** apires@sawc.org.za

SAWMA Symposium: Balancing the Books for Biodiversity 22 – 23 September 2003

The Southern African Wildlife Management Association will hold this symposium and invites all members and interested parties to attend at the Ganzekraal Conference Centre on the Cape West Coast, approximately 60 km from Cape Town. The event will be hosted by the Department of Animal Sciences at the faculty of Agricultural & Forestry Sciences of the University of Stellenbosch. The following themes will be presented:

- If it Pays it Stays – A Terrestrial Scenario
- Habitat Diversity & Wildlife Management
- The Role of Genetics in Biodiversity Conservation
- Habitat Rehabilitation
- Conservation at Landscape Level
- Sustainable Utilization of Marine Resources
- Conservation of Freshwater Aquatic Systems
- Regional Planning and Legislation

Registration fee: R600 for SAWMA members, R350 for students and R800 for non-members. Registration forms should reach the SAWMA secretariat before **15 August 2003**. For details check with the SAWMA Secretariat, P.O. Box 217, Bloubergstrand, 7436, Elma Marais, Tel 021- 5541297; email: elma@mweb.co.za

AI

18 Important Notice to Members of the African Chapter

Special Member Meeting

The Executive Committee of the African Chapter has decided to call a Special Meeting of the members of the African Chapter in accordance with Section 9 of the African Chapter Constitution.

The sole point of the agenda is to determine the future of the African Chapter. According to the Constitution point 9.7. the quorum shall be that of those present members eligible to vote and point 9.8.3. voting by proxy is not permissible.

Date of the Special Meeting: July 17th 2003

Place: Zulu Nyala Country Manor
Chartwell, Johannesburg

Members are requested to advise their wish to attend to gerhard@muskwa.co.za or fax 011-784-2074 not later than July 11th.

African Conservation Organizations

WWF-South Africa, Private Bag X2, Die Boord 7613, RSA, richardson@wwfsa.org.za, www.panda.org.za

TRAFFIC East & Southern Africa, Private Bag X11, Parkview 2122, RSA, trafficza@uskonet.com

Namibia Nature Foundation, PO Box 245, Windhoek, Namibia, nmf@nnf.org.na, www.nnf.org.na

Kalahari Conservation Society, PO Box 859, Gaborone, Botswana, www.delin.org/kalahari

East African Wildlife Society, PO Box 20110, 00200 Nairobi, Kenya, <http://www.eawildlife.org/index.php>

The Wildlife and Environment Society of South Africa (WESSA), PO Box 394, Howick 3290, RSA, mjp@futurenet.co.za, www.wildlifesociety.org.za

Endangered Wildlife Trust (EWT), Private Bag X11, Parkview 2122, RSA, ewt@ewt.org.za, www.ewt.org.za

African Wildlife Foundation (AWF) Zambezi Center, PO Box CT 570, Victoria Falls, Zimbabwe, fourcourners@awfzw.org, www.awf.org

Late Breaking News

Moosa wants to do away with Provincial Parks Boards. Valli Moosa, South Africa's minister of Environmental Affairs and Tourism said it is impractical for the country to have a national parks board, as well as nine provincial parks boards. Speaking in his budget vote speech to parliament, he said the current model is financially unsustainable, and is a disservice to conservation and to citizens. He added that it was still government's aim to expand the national area under protection from 5.44% to 8% by the year 2010.

AI