

INTERNATIONAL AND REGIONAL BEST PRACTICE

AND

LESSONS APPLICABLE TO SPORT AND RECREATIONAL HUNTING

IN SOUTHERN AFRICA

August 2005

Prepared by

Vernon Booth

On behalf of Panel of Experts
Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism
Pretoria
South Africa

Final Draft

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TOC \o "1-3" \f \h \z \u	HYPERLINK \l "_Toc113618589" EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	
PAGEREF _Toc113618589 \h i		
HYPERLINK \l "_Toc113618590" ACRONYMS		PAGEREF _Toc113618590 \h vii
HYPERLINK \l "_Toc113618591" 1 INTRODUCTION		PAGEREF _Toc113618591 \h 1
HYPERLINK \l "_Toc113618592" 1.1 International and Regional Best Practices and Lessons		PAGEREF _Toc113618592 \h 1
HYPERLINK \l "_Toc113618593" 1.2 Historical Prospective		PAGEREF _Toc113618593 \h 1
HYPERLINK \l "_Toc113618594" 1.3 Dynamics of sport hunting industry		PAGEREF _Toc113618594 \h 2
HYPERLINK \l "_Toc113618595" 2 ETHICS AND CODES OF CONDUCT		PAGEREF _Toc113618595 \h 4
HYPERLINK \l "_Toc113618596" 2.1 International Trends in Ethics, Regulation and Codes of Conduct		PAGEREF _Toc113618596 \h 4
HYPERLINK \l "_Toc113618597" 2.2 Trends in Ethics, Regulation and Codes of Conduct in Southern Africa		PAGEREF _Toc113618597 \h 6
HYPERLINK \l "_Toc113618598" 2.2.1 Certification of the Safari Hunting Industry		PAGEREF _Toc113618598 \h 9
HYPERLINK \l "_Toc113618599" 3 POLICIES, LEGISLATION AND LAND TENURE SYSTEMS		PAGEREF _Toc113618599 \h 11
HYPERLINK \l "_Toc113618600" 3.1 Policies Applicable to Hunting in Southern Africa		PAGEREF _Toc113618600 \h 11
HYPERLINK \l "_Toc113618601" 3.1.1 Zimbabwe		PAGEREF _Toc113618601 \h 11
HYPERLINK \l "_Toc113618602" 3.1.2 Botswana		PAGEREF _Toc113618602 \h 12
HYPERLINK \l "_Toc113618603" 3.1.3 Namibia		PAGEREF _Toc113618603 \h 14
HYPERLINK \l "_Toc113618604" 3.1.4 Zambia		PAGEREF _Toc113618604 \h 18
HYPERLINK \l "_Toc113618605" 3.1.5 Tanzania		PAGEREF _Toc113618605 \h 19
HYPERLINK \l "_Toc113618606" 3.2 Land Tenure, “Ownership” of Wildlife and the Hunting Industry		PAGEREF _Toc113618606 \h 22
HYPERLINK \l "_Toc113618607" 3.2.1 Hunting Systems on State Land		PAGEREF _Toc113618607 \h 22
HYPERLINK \l "_Toc113618608" 3.2.2 Hunting on other land		PAGEREF _Toc113618608 \h 24
HYPERLINK \l "_Toc113618609" 3.2.3 The “Ownership” of Wildlife		PAGEREF _Toc113618609 \h 26
HYPERLINK \l "_Toc113618610" 4 BEST PRACTICE NORMS AND STANDARDS REGULATING HUNTING IN SOUTHERN AFRICA		PAGEREF _Toc113618610 \h 28

HYPERLINK \l "_Toc113618611" 4.1	Recreational Hunting: Management and Administration	PAGEREF _Toc113618611 \h 28
HYPERLINK \l "_Toc113618612" 4.1.1	Tanzania	PAGEREF _Toc113618612 \h 28
HYPERLINK \l "_Toc113618613" 4.1.2	Zimbabwe	PAGEREF _Toc113618613 \h 28
HYPERLINK \l "_Toc113618614" 4.1.3	Botswana	PAGEREF _Toc113618614 \h 29
HYPERLINK \l "_Toc113618615" 4.1.4	Zambia	PAGEREF _Toc113618615 \h 30
HYPERLINK \l "_Toc113618616" 4.1.5	Namibia	PAGEREF _Toc113618616 \h 31
HYPERLINK \l "_Toc113618617" 4.2	Sport Hunting: Management and Administration	PAGEREF _Toc113618617 \h 31
HYPERLINK \l "_Toc113618618" 4.2.1	Tanzania	PAGEREF _Toc113618618 \h 31
HYPERLINK \l "_Toc113618619" 4.2.2	Zimbabwe	PAGEREF _Toc113618619 \h 33
HYPERLINK \l "_Toc113618620" 4.2.3	Botswana	PAGEREF _Toc113618620 \h 35
HYPERLINK \l "_Toc113618621" 4.2.4	Zambia	PAGEREF _Toc113618621 \h 37
HYPERLINK \l "_Toc113618622" 4.2.5	Namibia	PAGEREF _Toc113618622 \h 38
HYPERLINK \l "_Toc113618623" 4.3	Quota Setting Methods for Sport Hunting	PAGEREF _Toc113618623 \h 44
HYPERLINK \l "_Toc113618624" 4.3.1	Zimbabwe	PAGEREF _Toc113618624 \h 45
HYPERLINK \l "_Toc113618625" 4.3.2	Botswana	PAGEREF _Toc113618625 \h 45
HYPERLINK \l "_Toc113618626" 4.3.3	Tanzania	PAGEREF _Toc113618626 \h 46
HYPERLINK \l "_Toc113618627" 4.3.4	Zambia	PAGEREF _Toc113618627 \h 47
HYPERLINK \l "_Toc113618628" 4.4	Community Involvement in the Hunting Industry	PAGEREF _Toc113618628 \h 47
HYPERLINK \l "_Toc113618629" 4.4.1	Definition of a "Joint Venture" Contract	PAGEREF _Toc113618629 \h 47
HYPERLINK \l "_Toc113618630" 4.4.2	Legal Interpretation of a "Joint Venture"	PAGEREF _Toc113618630 \h 48
HYPERLINK \l "_Toc113618631" 4.4.3	Type and Duration of Contracts	PAGEREF _Toc113618631 \h 48
HYPERLINK \l "_Toc113618632" 4.4.4	Options for Awarding Contracts	PAGEREF _Toc113618632 \h 51
HYPERLINK \l "_Toc113618633" 4.5	Marketing of Sport Hunting	PAGEREF _Toc113618633 \h 53
HYPERLINK \l "_Toc113618634" 4.5.1	General marketing strategies	PAGEREF _Toc113618634 \h 53
HYPERLINK \l "_Toc113618635" 4.5.2	Classic marketing strategies	PAGEREF Toc113618635 \h 57

HYPERLINK \l "_Toc113618636" 4.6	Training and Licensing of Professional Hunters	PAGEREF _Toc113618636 \h 57
HYPERLINK \l "_Toc113618637" 4.7	Monitoring of the Sport Hunting Industry	PAGEREF _Toc113618637 \h 60
HYPERLINK \l "_Toc113618638" 4.7.1	Tanzania	PAGEREF _Toc113618638 \h 60
HYPERLINK \l "_Toc113618639" 4.7.2	Zimbabwe	PAGEREF _Toc113618639 \h 61
HYPERLINK \l "_Toc113618640" 4.7.3	Botswana	PAGEREF _Toc113618640 \h 62
HYPERLINK \l "_Toc113618641" 5	MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION OF SPORT HUNTING IN SELECTED EUROPEAN COUNTRIES	PAGEREF _Toc113618641 \h 63
HYPERLINK \l "_Toc113618642" 5.1	Norway	PAGEREF _Toc113618642 \h 63
HYPERLINK \l "_Toc113618643" 5.2	Poland	PAGEREF _Toc113618643 \h 64
HYPERLINK \l "_Toc113618644" 5.3	The Czech Republic	PAGEREF _Toc113618644 \h 64
HYPERLINK \l "_Toc113618645" 5.4	The British Isles:	PAGEREF _Toc113618645 \h 65
HYPERLINK \l "_Toc113618646" 5.5	Austria	PAGEREF _Toc113618646 \h 66
HYPERLINK \l "_Toc113618647" 5.6	Spain	PAGEREF _Toc113618647 \h 67
HYPERLINK \l "_Toc113618648" 5.7	Italy	PAGEREF _Toc113618648 \h 68
HYPERLINK \l "_Toc113618649" 6	KEY LESSONS OF RELEVANCE	PAGEREF _Toc113618649 \h 70
HYPERLINK \l "_Toc113618650" 6.1	Ethics and Codes of Conduct	PAGEREF _Toc113618650 \h 70
HYPERLINK \l "_Toc113618651" 6.2	Policy and Legislation	PAGEREF _Toc113618651 \h 71
HYPERLINK \l "_Toc113618652" 6.2.1	“Ownership” of Wildlife	PAGEREF _Toc113618652 \h 71
HYPERLINK \l "_Toc113618653" 6.3	Management and Administration of Hunting	PAGEREF _Toc113618653 \h 71
HYPERLINK \l "_Toc113618654" 6.3.1	Government Administration	PAGEREF _Toc113618654 \h 71
HYPERLINK \l "_Toc113618655" 6.3.2	Recreational and Sport Hunting Associations	PAGEREF _Toc113618655 \h 72
HYPERLINK \l "_Toc113618656" 6.4	Community Involvement	PAGEREF _Toc113618656 \h 72
HYPERLINK \l "_Toc113618657" 6.5	Monitoring the Performance of Hunting Industry	PAGEREF _Toc113618657 \h 73
HYPERLINK \l "_Toc113618658" 6.5.1	Licence and Permitting Systems	PAGEREF _Toc113618658 \h 73
HYPERLINK \l "_Toc113618659" 6.5.2	Quota Setting	PAGEREF _Toc113618659 \h 73
HYPERLINK \l "_Toc113618660" 6.5.3	Training and registration of recreational and	

[professional hunters](#) PAGEREF _Toc113618660 \h 74

HYPERLINK \l "_Toc113618661" [6.5.4](#) [Marketing of hunts](#) PAGEREF
_Toc113618661 \h 74

HYPERLINK \l "_Toc113618662" [6.5.5](#) [Hunting tenure and allocation systems](#)
PAGEREF _Toc113618662 \h 75

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This paper, that examines the international and regional best practices in managing and administering recreational and sport hunting, has been prepared on behalf of the Panel of Experts appointed by the Minister of Environment and Tourism in South Africa whose brief it is to develop norms and standards for the regulation of hunting in South Africa.

The topics examined include international trends with regard to ethics and codes of conduct for professional and recreational hunting; trends in professional and recreational hunting management and administration; and key best practices, norms and standards that guide the different aspects of the professional and recreational hunting industry.

The report examines published data on the hunting industries of Tanzania, Zambia, Botswana, Namibia and Zimbabwe as well as consultations with key stakeholders from these countries. Data from Europe is provided for comparison.

A distinction is made between “recreational hunting” that refers to hunting activities undertaken by citizens of the countries and “sport (or safari) hunting” in which professional outfitters and hunters are contracted to guide an international client on a hunt to secure a specific “bag” of trophy animals. The administration and management of this form of the hunting industry attracts the most attention and requires the highest levels of management from wildlife authorities.

Historical Prospective

To place the hunting industry in prospective, a brief history of the development of recreational and sport hunting is provided. In particular, the standards and codes of conduct developed in the early years of the 19th century have provided the foundation for the administrative and management systems that exist today.

Ethics and Codes of Conduct

Regulations for administration and management of the hunting industry are embedded in the policies and legal instruments of the various Southern African countries’ where hunting is practiced. There also exist codes of conduct that define the “ethics” and “fair chase” of hunting.

Recreational hunters generally adhere to the concept of “Fair Chase”, however with few exceptions this group of hunters is not organised in any way at a national level. Defining hunting ethics and codes of conduct for this group of hunters is therefore reliant on the integrity of the individual hunter. However, applying “ethics” and “codes of conduct” to the sport hunting industry is far more difficult and is achieved through stringent regulations. While commercial hunting is by and large well regulated and professional outfitters and hunters acknowledge the tradition of sport hunting, it is not mandatory for any person to belong to a hunting association or club. Disciplining the professional segment of the industry is therefore extremely difficult, especially where there is a weak government authority that does not vigorously apply the law.

Policies, Legislation and Land Tenure Systems

The policies, legislation and land tenure system applicable to the management and administration of hunting in Southern Africa vary greatly. Some countries have developed progressive policies that have encouraged the diversification of the wildlife industry and with

it the growth of hunting as a legitimate form of land use. Zimbabwe led the way in developing these policies in the 1970's and 1980's, but is now grappling with revised policies that are attempting to maximise livelihood options for resettled farmers. Botswana has over the last 25 years developed conservation policies aimed at improving the well being of the nation by encouraging the full spectrum of wildlife utilization activities, but the ownership of wildlife is still vested in the State.

The management and administration of hunting in Namibia presents special problems because of the nomadic and migratory nature of the wildlife. Its policies advocate the fencing of private properties and the development of conservancies by multiple landholders in order to derive benefits from hunting. The development of the hunting industry in Zambia closely mirrored that of Zimbabwe, except this country did not establish safari areas but retained Game Management Areas (GMAs) that are part of communally owned reserves or trust land. The industry is not as developed as that elsewhere in the region, and is grappling with policies and strategies to accommodate its parastatal Zambia Wildlife Authority (ZAWA), and devolving full authority to local communities

Tanzania has the longest history in the management and administration of hunting that has evolved over the last 115 years. Its development has progressed through several turbulent periods, including a brief period when it was banned, but now represents the largest hunting industry in Africa. All aspects of wildlife management are firmly under the control of the Wildlife Division (WD), although there are initiatives to involve local communities in wildlife management through the establishment of Authorised Associations (AAs).

“Ownership” of Wildlife

The issue of land tenure and the “ownership” of wildlife have dictated the development of the hunting management and administrative systems industry across Southern Africa since the 1960's. Generally the overall responsibility for wildlife rests with the government that implement various policies and strategies depending on the land tenure systems that apply. The level of control may be minimal or extensive with the wildlife agencies defining hunting seasons, levels of off take and hunting regulations.

Various categories of land where hunting occurs are recognised across the region, and the level of protection and management strategies for each of these depends on their status in terms of the respective conservation legislation. Communally owned land presents special problems, with various Community Based Natural Resource Management initiatives being developed with mixed success. Namibia has devolved authority to the lowest institutional level and is implementing innovative programmes centred on the concept of conservancies developed on private land.

Best Practice Norms and Standards Regulating the Southern African Hunting Industry

The extent of the hunting industry and the opportunities available vary greatly between the SADC countries where hunting is conducted. Direct comparisons of management and administrative strategies are therefore difficult.

Recreational hunting that meets the needs of citizen and resident hunters is permitted in all the Southern African countries. The management and administrative systems regulating this form of hunting vary in their level of sophistication depending on the capacity of the wildlife agencies and the organisation of local hunters. Resident hunting in Tanzania is restricted to open areas and hunting permits are issued by District Game Officers for a variety of common game species. The fees are low and there is no effective supervision of this form of hunting. In Zimbabwe user rights over nearly all species of wildlife are conferred on landowners of

private land with few restrictions. Informal recreational hunting was a common practice, and abuse of this privilege was controlled through (no defunct) Intensive Conservation Area (ICA) committees mandated to monitor and discipline landowners. Unique to Zimbabwe are the Zambezi Valley Auction Hunts where recreational hunters are able to bid at an open auction for the opportunity to hunt big game.

Recreational hunting is best developed in Botswana where hunting is regarded as a right and not a privilege. This form of hunting is controlled through a variety of permits and licences that cater for all segments of the community. A similar, but not as sophisticated system exists in Zambia that caters for recreational hunting by Zambian residents in a selection of GMAs and Open Areas. Recreational “*Biltong*” Hunting in Namibia is mainly meat motivated and undertaken by residents and landowners (one permit per hunter), and involves only four of the most populous species (Kudu, Gemsbok, Springbok and Warthog).

The **sport hunting industry** is extensive in Southern Africa with various approaches adopted to manage and administer this lucrative industry. Tanzania leases concessions on five-year tenure to hunting outfitters that fulfil the requirements defined in a set of hunting regulations. The hunting bocks are awarded by an Advisory Committee appointed by the Minister of Natural Resources and Tourism, and not by open tender or auction. Each concession is allocated a quota of animals, and outfitters are required to utilise not less than 40% of the value of the total quota allocated. The Wildlife Division is responsible for the management and administration of the industry. A rigid system of fees is applied in which the bulk of the income is generated from the use of the quota, and not the right to hunt. A comprehensive permit system is used to monitor the hunting activities of international clients.

Sport hunting in Zimbabwe occurs on all land categories: private, communal land, Forestry Land and Safari Area concessions. Allocation of hunting on these lands varies. Private land hunting is either undertaken by the landowner/game rancher or by direct negotiations with an independent outfitter. Communal land concessions are awarded through tender and administered through negotiated joint venture agreements. The Parks and Wildlife Authority offer hunting concessions on 3 – 5-year leases in the Safari Areas that are awarded under a closed tender system. All foreign hunters visiting Zimbabwe are required to complete a TR2 form (or permit) prior to the hunt taking place and have this approved by the Parks Authority. This form registers a profile of the client and conditions of the hunt. It also records details of all animals hunted during the safari.

In Botswana the DWNP, under the Ministry of Environment and Tourism is the primary government agency responsible for wildlife and sport hunting management. As with the other countries, regulation is through a license system. Analysis of these licenses provides a tool to monitor the industry, although this is less successful for resident hunters than international hunters. Allocation of hunting concessions under community-based programmes in Wildlife Management Areas is through a “Head Agreement” with the Land Board in which Community Trust is granted sole rights of managing the resources within the WMA. Prospective bidders for the hunting rights are required to submit technical and financial proposals that are adjudicated by a committee consisting of the Trust, Land Board and DWNP.

The Zambia, a Non Resident Hunting Licence is issued to registered Hunting Outfitter’s holding a Safari Hunting Concession Agreement with ZAWA. A Non-Resident Hunting Licence is issued to the client that prescribes the fees and what animals are to be hunted. This licence is counter signed on completion of the hunt by ZAWA Wildlife Police Officers or Village Game Scouts) as well as the Professional Hunter.

Namibia maintains one of the most well-regulated and managed sport hunting industries in the region. Management is focused on attaining maximum economic and social benefits

from a finite hunting resource in all of the countries land tenure systems. This has been achieved through the establishment of private, non-governmental and governmental management structures that have ensured that standards are maintained and monitoring and administration systems put in place so that informed management decisions can be made. The majority of hunting occurs on private land sector with limited hunting occurring on communally owned land where conservancies have been established. Community Conservancy Concessions are awarded through joint venture agreements that are negotiated with the help of the NGO community. An example of the steps required to complete these negotiations is provided.

Quota Setting Methods

No ideal system or methodology exists in the region that can be regarded as the “best practice” for setting quotas for sport hunting. The general opinion is that in the absence of reliable biological information and population trends for all species that are hunted, quotas should be set on a rigorous objective basis, and strive to achieve consistency in quota allocations.

Community Involvement in the Hunting Industry

Involvement of communities in the hunting industry is generally through some form of “joint venture” agreement with private sector outfitters. A comprehensive review of the processes adopted to involve communities in the hunting industry is provided including the definitions of a “joint venture”, their legal implications and the types, duration and pricing structures of such agreements.

Marketing of Sport Hunting

The strategies adopted by outfitters to market sport hunting has an important bearing on the way that the industry is managed. Outfitters respond differently depending on the manner in which quotas are allocated, and this in turn influences the administrative decisions taken by wildlife agencies. Generally the industry should aim at achieving the bulk of its income from the daily rate charges and not from trophy fees. The wildlife authorities need to ensure that the industry is managed in such a way as to achieve this goal or order to sustain positive growth. This report discusses the various options and strategies to achieve this objective by examining the relationship between the wildlife agency, the outfitter and the hunting client.

Training and Licensing of Professional Hunters

The standards set for the training and licensing of professional hunters in Namibia, Botswana and Zimbabwe are very high, and have been developed over several years. Obtaining a professional license requires that trainee professional hunters undergo an apprenticeship and successfully complete theoretical exams as well as a shooting marksmanship practical exam. The curriculum developed by the ZPHGA in Zimbabwe is used to illustrate what is required.

Monitoring of the Sport Hunting Industry

Monitoring of the sport hunting industry relies on the analysis of hunting permits and licenses that are returned by the outfitters, and extensive analysis of these documents has been completed for Tanzania, Botswana, Namibia and Zimbabwe. The data is comprehensive and includes information on client details, hunting companies, professional hunters, start and end dates of hunting safaris, animals hunted, trophy measurements etc. However, while these databases are extremely valuable to decision makers, they are not regularly maintained and there is a tendency to overwhelm the capacity of the wildlife

management agencies to manage these permit systems.

Management and Administration Hunting in Selected European Countries

For comparison purposes the management and administrative systems adopted in seven European countries are provided. In most of these countries the law recognises that the right to hunting belongs to the landowner, but the animals to be hunted are managed either by national, regional or municipal authorities. All hunters are required to undergo a “once in a life time examination” and to be registered with the regulators and/or a hunting association. Annual hunting licenses are required as are individual licences for the animals to be hunted. The landowner benefits from hunting activities by raising a fee of the rent of the property or “hunting ground”. Considerable sums of money are generated in this way that is used to maintain sustainable hunting practices in these countries. Consequently there are a large number of hunters and wildlife populations are professionally managed to maintain wildlife habitats.

Key Lessons of Relevance

The final chapter of this report draws out key lessons of relevance to the Panel of Experts. Summarised, these include:

Regarding Codes of Conduct and Ethics:

Codes of Conduct and the ethics of hunting are well established and embedded in the legal framework in most Southern African countries. Implementing these is however problematic, especially as few formal institutions exist that represent recreational hunters. Little effort is made to re-invest in the management and administration of recreational hunting that is highly subsidised through under valued pricing structures. The high profile commercial sport hunting industry is regulated mainly through the respective wildlife agencies and professional hunting associations. The effectiveness and capacity of these associations varies considerably, and compulsory membership of such associations is not a requirement.

Regarding Policy and Legislation:

The importance of a policy and legislative framework that devolves the right to hunt and “ownership” of wildlife to the lowest possible level cannot be under-estimated. The role of government should be to develop the regulatory framework that promotes the sustainable utilisation of wildlife, and encourage the development of professional member organisations mandated to self regulate all recreational and sport hunting activities.

Regarding the Management and Administration of Hunting

The mandate for the management and administration of the hunting industry is vested in national government and parastatal wildlife agencies, and not at the level of Districts or Municipalities. Access rights are devolved to landowners and appropriate authorities; however the policy environment is diffuse. No single department exists within any specific agency that has the overall responsibility for directly managing and administering the hunting industry. Government institutions responsible for hunting administration and management are generally under resourced.

Recreational and Sport Hunting Associations

Recreational and sport hunting associations exist across the region, but differ considerably in their strength and effectiveness.

Associations representing commercial sport hunting exhibit a general lack of cohesion, strategic thinking and planning.

Professional associations suffer from a lack of resources as well as the lack of a legal mandate to maintain standards and levels of professionalism.

Community Involvement

The central issue in all the CBNRM initiatives in the region is land tenure and the ownership and management of the natural resources thereon.

A thorough understanding of landownership, tenure systems and property rights is therefore essential for the success of the CBNRM programmes.

The effectiveness of CBNRM in the region is dependent on the level that proprietorship and incentives have been devolved to the lowest community level.

Monitoring the Performance of Hunting Industry

Monitoring systems based on permit systems are well developed.

Limited capacity exists to professionally analyse these data

Licensing and permit systems applicable to the sport hunting industry are compulsory.

Quota Setting

No perfect system exists to set sustainable quotas.

Acquiring reliable data aerial and ground survey techniques to monitor sport hunting quotas are expensive and time consuming.

Alternative long term indicators have not been developed.

Training and registration of recreational and professional hunters

Registration and training of recreational hunters is not a requirement in the region.

Organisations representing recreational hunters are missing in the region.

Well developed training and apprentice systems for professional hunters exist.

There are no systems in place to cross reference the credentials of professional hunters, and therefore it is difficult to maintain common standards and regulate professional hunters across the region.

Marketing of hunts

The “mix” and size of the quota allocations is crucial for the success of selling hunts to the European and USA markets.

The average trophy fees for most plains game species have not increased significantly in more than 10 years.

Marketing commercial hunting on the basis of large hunting bags has tended to drive up quotas.

Hunting tenure and allocation systems

The trend has been to offer concessions on 3 – 5 year leases.

The options available are confined to one of the following:

Direct negotiation with a prospective investor

Open Competitive Tender
Open Auction

ACRONYMS

AA	Appropriate Authority/Authorised Association
ADA	Agricultural Development Authority
BOCOBONET	Botswana Community-Based Organisation Network
BWMA	Botswana Wildlife Management Association
CAMPFIRE	Communal Areas Management Programme for Indigenous Resources
CBC	Community Based Conservation
CBOs	Community Based Organisations,
CBNRM	Community Based Natural Resource Management
CHA	Controlled Hunting Area/Community Hunting Area
CITES	Convention for the International Trade in Endangered Species
CSC	Cold Storage Commission
DNPWLM	Department of National Parks and Wildlife Management (Zimbabwe)
DWNP	Department of Wildlife and National Parks (Botswana)
DHA	Danish Hunters Association
EU	European Union
GCAs	Game Controlled Areas
GMA	Game Management Areas
GTZ	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (German government agency for international cooperation)
HG	Hunting Guide
ICA	Intensive Conservation Area
IUCN	International Union for the Conservation of Nature
LIFE	Living in a Finite Environment (Namibia)
NGO	Non-government Organisation
NP	National Park
NPWA	National Parks and Wildlife Authority (Zimbabwe)
PAWM	Planning and Assessment for Wildlife Management Project
PHA	Polish Hunters Association
PH	Professional Hunter
PWMA	Parks and Wildlife Management Authority (Zimbabwe)
MET	Ministry of Environment and Tourism (Namibia)
MHG	Master Hunting Guide
MOMS	Management Orientated Monitoring Systems
MRU	Matetsi Research Unit (Zimbabwe)
NAPHA	Namibia Professional Hunters Association
NDP	National Development Plan (Botswana)
RAD	Remote Area Dweller
RAO	Recommended Allowable Off-take
RALE	Representative, accountable and legal entity
RDC	Rural District Council's
SADC	Southern African Development Corporation
SARPO	Southern African Regional Project Office
SA	Safari Area
SCI	Safari Club International
SGR	Selous Game Reserve
TANAPA	Tanzania National Parks Authority
TAHOA	Tanzania Hunting Operators Association),
TAWICO	Tanzania Wildlife Corporation
TGLP	Tribal Grazing Land Policy
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
WCMD	Wildlife Conservation and Management Department (Kenya)
WD	Wildlife Division

WESP	Wildlife Economic Spatial Planning
WWF	World Wide Fund for Nature
WMA	Wildlife Management Areas)
ZATSO	Zimbabwe Association of Tour and Safari Operators
ZAWA	Zambia Wildlife Authority
ZHA	Zimbabwe Hunters Association
ZPHGA	Zimbabwe Professional Hunters and Guides Association
ZTA	Zimbabwe Tourism Authority

INTRODUCTION

International and Regional Best Practices and Lessons

This paper is one of four research papers prepared on behalf of the Panel of Experts appointed by the Minister of Environment and Tourism in South Africa whose brief it is to develop norms and standards for the regulation of hunting in South Africa. This lucrative and complex industry commands a high profile in terms of conservation and socio-economics, and attracts the attention and emotions driven by animal welfare groups, hunters and conservationists alike.

This document examines the international and regional best practices in managing and administering recreational and sport hunting, and examines three broad topics:

International trends with regard to ethics, regulations and development of codes of conduct for professional and recreational hunting.

Trends in Southern Africa and the different ways in which professional and recreational hunting is being managed.

The key best practices, norms and standards that guide the different aspects of the professional and recreational hunting industry.

In preparing this document, extensive reference has been made to numerous publications that have analysed the sport hunting industry either at the SADC level or nationally in Tanzania, Zimbabwe, Botswana, Zambia and Namibia. However many of these publications are now outdated. The most comprehensive summary of the sport hunting industry is provided in the

TRAFFIC report “*Sport Hunting in the SADC Region: An Overview*” prepared in 2001. To overcome this problem, various key persons and organisations directly involved in the management and administration of sport hunting both in Southern Africa and Europe have been consulted to verify data and information. In addition various internet websites of hunting associations, companies and wildlife agencies linked to the sport hunting industry have also been consulted.

For ease of understanding, this report first summarises the historical development of sport hunting and its codes of conduct. It then provides an in depth description of the policies, legislation and land tenure systems that impact on the management and administration strategies adopted in Tanzania, Zimbabwe, Botswana, Zambia and Namibia. A summary is also provided of management and administrative systems adopted in some European countries. These examples are then used to extract the key conclusions and recommendations of relevance for the Panel of Experts.

Historical Prospective

In his book, “**Safari: A Chronicle of Adventure**”, Bartell Bull captures the history of the “safari industry” from its inception in the 1600’s when the first European travellers arrived in the Cape, to the sophisticated commercial operations of the 1980’s. He segregates this first into a period when travellers who ventured north from Cape Town in the 1600 and 1700’s discovered animals that were unknown to Europe at that time. Hunting by Europeans then was to protect livestock, for food and for commercial gain (mostly through sale of hides and ivory) rather than for sport.

For Europeans penetrating the interior of Africa in the early nineteenth century, animals of all descriptions abounded. So too did the excitement of hunting these animals when compared with the “tame” fox, boar, pheasant and stag hunting with which they were

familiar. This was the beginning of a century long period lasting from 1830's to 1930's when unique conditions and eccentric individuals created the environment that set the stage for the development of the "Africa safari" as it is known today. Game was abundant, landscapes were ungoverned by conservation laws, suitable weapons with which to hunt "big game" were developed, and legends of great safaris and the habit of hunting dangerous game were described in natural history journals and books by authors such as Cornwallis Harris, Gordon Cumming, Charles Baldwin, Frederick Selous, William Finaughty and others.

By 1900 it was no longer the day of the lonely eccentrics who lived for the lifestyle and earned a living from hunting elephant for ivory. A new breed of hunter began to emerge. These were well-healed people essentially on a sporting holiday that needed local expertise to plan and lead their expeditions to the field. Perhaps the most famous of these is the Teddy Roosevelt safari of 1910 to East Africa in which Frederick Selous and Edward Buxton were used as principle advisors. The Roosevelt safari covered four countries (Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania and Somalia) and lasted several months. Large numbers of animals were hunted and specimens collected for museums. This safari also brought to the fore the question of "ethics" as many of the early settlers in Kenya began to question the hunting methods of this (and subsequent) safaris where wounded animals were not followed up and dispatched and "trophies" were collected unnecessarily.

This was also the beginning of the commercialisation of recreational hunting in East Africa. The years 1908 – 1914 were a time when "princes, peers and American magnates" poured out in one continuous stream to hunt all over East Africa. Pioneers who took up farming in East Africa supplemented their income by organising and conducting these "safaris" for reward, which in turn gave birth to the "professional white hunter". But it was not until after the First World War that the safari industry was consolidated. The period between 1919 and 1939 saw the birth of the professional safari hunting company or "outfitter", and the establishment of the reputation of "professional hunters" that escorted "clients" on well organised and equipped safaris to Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania. This too was the period that codes of conduct were developed to guide the fledgling sport hunting industry, and set the standards under which it operated.

After the Second World War, sport hunting as a business became more organised with Kenya leading the way. A system of recreational hunting blocks was identified across the country, and laws and regulations governing the way in which hunting safaris were conducted were developed, using the "codes of conduct" as the basis. Licence fees and hunting permits were introduced that restricted hunting operations to certain blocks and professional hunters were registered after undergoing an apprenticeship and being approved by the strict rules that governed the East African Professional Hunters Association. This Association was held in high regard that later became the benchmark for the development of the sport hunting industry in Southern Africa in the 1960's.

Dynamics of sport hunting industry

In preparing this paper the distinction is made between "recreational hunting" and "sport (or safari) hunting". Recreational hunting refers to hunting activities undertaken by individuals where the primary objective is to bag one or more animals (male or female) more for the meat value and not necessary as a "trophy". Usually this form of hunting is undertaken by nationals or residents of a country and does not involve a professional hunter or outfitter.

Sport hunting (or safari hunting) is the commercial form of hunting where an international hunter engages the services of a professional outfitter and hunter to guide him/her on a hunt either for a specific species or a "bag" of several different animals. The primary objective here is to secure a "trophy" that is representative of the adult male. The administration and

management of this form of the hunting industry is determined by a number of factors:

Policy and legislative environment

Appropriate monitoring, accountability, and transparency of the wildlife management authorities

Reputation and integrity of the professional outfitters and professional hunters

Marketability of the hunt in terms of

The number and mix of species available to be hunted

Cost of the animals

Reputation of the area to be hunted

International competitiveness of the hunt

Trophy quality and total cost of the safari

Political stability of the country

These factors are dynamic and involve the wildlife management authority, the professional hunting industry (as the service provider) and the hunter (or client). Getting all these factors to move in the same direction provides the framework in which the “best practice” of the industry can be judged.

The problem with the development of practices and regulations for the safari industry is that in the early days most governments saw wildlife in the context of crop destruction and damage which created the need for “problem animal control” and vermin rewards. “Game and Tsetse Control Departments” were established to control wildlife so that land could be opened up for conventional agriculture. Controlled shooting by these departments resulted in enormous numbers of wild animals being killed.

The fact that sport hunting gained in popularity in Southern Africa left many wildlife authorities hard pressed to develop the administrative systems to deal with this multi-million dollar industry. Without exception, wildlife agencies have found that sport hunting is the most difficult and problematic to administer. The major problems are centred on systems of “ownership” and access to wildlife, concession allocation and length of tenure, pricing of hunting, setting quotas, managing hunting outfitters and professional hunters, involvement of local communities, and the demand for a high level of professional management from ecologists, economists and practical wildlife managers.

Above all the politics of hunting at all levels – local, national, regional and internationally – presents special problems and issues for the wildlife management authorities, especially because the sport hunting industry is seen as a highly lucrative business involving large amounts of foreign currency (from an African perspective) and attracts the attention of the animal welfare fraternity (from a European and American perspective). None of these problems and issues has been totally solved in any one system in the region, although some countries tend to cope better than others.

ETHICS AND CODES OF CONDUCT

The best practices and norms regulating the safari industry in east and Southern Africa are enunciated in the various host country's policies, acts and regulations. The industry is also regulated through codes of conduct that define the "ethics" and "fair chase" of hunting. In the sections that follow, the best practices and norms regulating the industry in the region are examined in terms of international trends with regard to ethics, regulations and codes of conduct.

International Trends in Ethics, Regulation and Codes of Conduct

The ethics, regulations and codes of conduct that govern sport and recreational hunting in Southern Africa originate from Europe and America. Recreational and sport hunting in these countries is regarded as a privilege – subsistence hunting has virtually disappeared, unlike in many parts of Southern Africa. In addition, the volume of hunters and the areas available for hunting cannot be compared with that of Southern Africa. For example, through its 34 members, the national hunters' associations of the Member States of the European Union and other Council of Europe countries, FACE represents the interests of some 7 million hunters (<http://www.face-europe.org>).

Hunting in these European countries is therefore intensely managed through national laws and regulations, but also through hunting associations and clubs with strict codes of conduct. Members are held accountable in terms of these codes of conduct that have developed over many decades. For example, hunting by hounds, traps and falconry is regarded as unethical and is forbidden in some countries but not in others (see Chapter 5 for further information).

A further key factor impacting on the regulation of hunting in Europe is that the *hunting right* is generally vested in the landowner while the *ownership* of wildlife is vested in the State. This right can be sublet to a third party for varying lengths of time (up to 30 years in some instances), but the hunter must purchase a license from the local wildlife authority for any animal that he/she intends to hunt on the property. Landowners are encouraged to develop management plans for the wildlife, and since they directly benefit from the sale of hunting rights, there is an added incentive to manage the game populations effectively, and this includes adhering to the codes of conduct designed to ensure that hunting opportunities are maintained, game is used sustainably and the reputation of hunters in general is promoted.

To be able hunt in Europe therefore requires that the hunter is obligated to conduct the hunt in a professional and ethical manner. The codes of conduct vary from country to country in Europe, but the common theme found throughout includes the following:

With respect to the law:

All hunting and shooting must take place in accordance with the current hunting legislation. Hunting must not be degraded to the mere shooting of game.

All game shot must be, whenever possible, utilized as food or fur products, as trophies or in another appropriate manner.

Unusable game or parts thereof must be buried or destroyed.

All species of game must be treated with equal respect.

Bagged game must be treated with due respect and care.

Always leave the countryside as it was when you arrived. Hunting must not leave traces of activity in the countryside.

Never hunt released game that does not have a natural behavioural pattern.

Never hunt during periods or in areas in which the game is subject to adverse conditions, for

example, during periods of hard winter, in fenced areas or during flight feather moulting periods.

If you are a novice, then try to learn from experienced hunters and always make demands on your own behaviour and that of other hunters.

Contribute towards the preservation of game and habitats.

Respect hunting etiquette, i.e., special hunting “jargon” and the traditional manners and conventions of hunters.

With respect to hunting:

All hunting and shooting must take place in accordance within the sustainable use of the game populations i.e. adhere to quotas and animals available on bought license.

Be fully familiar with your game and only shoot when you are sure of its identity.

Avoid bagging game which you do not intend to utilize.

Avoid hunting or shooting when the weather makes the game more vulnerable.

Contribute to the acquisition of essential knowledge regarding game populations.

Limit disturbance due to hunting whenever possible.

Always ensure an appropriate balance in your cull of male and female animals and of young and old individuals.

Take care that you manage “your” game and game preserves in the same manner that you wish that your hunting neighbours would manage “theirs”.

With respect to weapon handling

Always use the appropriate weapons and ammunition for the respective hunting methods.

Weapons must suit the individual hunter or shooter and must be tested and zeroed in with good quality, efficient ammunition.

Improve and maintain your marksmanship with relevant weapon training.

Never shoot an animal from behind.

Never shoot without having a firm rest/support for your rifle or at distances more than 100 metres or shoot at running game.

Shoot only when there is an absolutely clear shot.

Do not try for a head or neck shot and do not shoot at unfavourable angles.

Do not shoot if there is a risk that more than one animal can be hit.

Only shoot a second shot at sound game when the possibility of a killing shot is just as good as with the first shot.

If the first shot wounds the bird or animal, do not attempt to shoot a new bird or animal.

Do not shoot at another animal if the first animal is not visibly dead.

Always assist in the recovery of shot and wounded game.

Assist in the search and dispatch of game that has been wounded by other hunters.

When hunting with a rifle, the number of bullets used should be almost equal to the number of game killed.

Kill wounded game in a humane manner (e.g. pistol shot to head, neck shot or knife).

With respect to hunting companions and non-hunters:

As a hunter, you are not the only person who is entitled to enjoy the countryside and woodlands. Always display a friendly attitude when you meet non-hunters

Remember that other people are typically not familiar with weapons. Always show due consideration and apply great care.

Never hunt when it is obvious that it is a disadvantage for others.

Always keep a safe distance to other hunters and non-hunters.

Respect the rights of other hunters.

Do not capitalize on neighbouring game populations and never shoot at game which is

driven from neighbouring grounds onto your own hunting area.

Always comment on hunting or shooting which is contrary to hunting legislation or in conflict with ethical hunting codes.

Always handle weapons carefully and observe safety precautions.

With respect to safety

Apply red cap ribbons or other visible signal apparel and, when shooting with shotguns, it is advisable to wear safety goggles.

Bear your weapon unloaded and in the open or drawn position and with vertical barrels between each beat.

Locate the positions of your adjacent hunters and establish visible contact with them. Safety angles must be at least 40 degrees and special care must be taken if there is any risk of ricochet from shot or bullets.

Never apply a low shot towards indefinite backgrounds.

Never shoot with a rifle unless there is a safe background to absorb the bullet.

Trends in Ethics, Regulation and Codes of Conduct in Southern Africa

Perhaps the difference between hunting in Southern Africa and that elsewhere, is the magnitude of the sport, and its level of development in terms of management and administration. In addition, three basic hunting systems apply – traditional (or subsistence) hunting, recreational hunting and sport hunting.

Traditional (or subsistence) hunting: This form of hunting by indigenous people has virtually disappeared as a result of the laws and regulations imposed by colonial governments. Before that time such rules were unnecessary as wildlife populations were plentiful and human populations were low. The exceptions were those regulations relating to consumptive use of wildlife enmeshed in local traditions and beliefs. But as human populations increased and wildlife populations decreased, legislation was introduced that entrenched privileges to the ruling class and alienated the local people in relation to hunting rights. Also entrenched in the legislation was the State ownership of all wildlife.

Traditional hunting by indigenous people is frowned upon by hunters with western values because the methods used are seen as being “unethical” e.g. snaring, driven hunts, hunting with dogs, use of pit traps, indiscriminate killing of males, females and young etc. But from the rural African point of view, hunting is fundamental to their livelihood coping strategies, and not undertaken for “sport” or for “recreation”. Wildlife is viewed as food and hunting is regarded as a right – not a privilege – although there did exist at one time “codes of conduct” imposed by traditional leaders that regulated this form of hunting. Where the difficulties now arise is that “traditional hunting” is often used as an excuse for commercial poaching either for “bush meat” or high value animal products such as ivory. The socio-economic factors driving this form of utilisation are complex, and in an attempt to resolve this various community-based natural resource management programmes have been developed.

Recreational Hunting: Generally recreational hunters in Southern Africa adhere to the following definition of “Fair Chase” as a uniform code of conduct and hunters abide by the “ethics” and regulations governing hunting in their respective countries. The Safari Club International African Chapter defines “Fair Chase” as:

Every sport hunter shall pursue an animal only by engaging in fair chase of the quarry. Fair Chase is defined as pursuit of a free ranging animal possessed of the natural behavioural inclination to escape from the hunter and be fully free to do so.

A sport hunted animal should exist as a naturally interacting individual of a wild

sustainable population, located in an area that meets both the spatial (territory and home range) and temporal (food, breeding and basic needs) requirements of the population, of which that individual is a member. Sport hunted animals should, wherever possible be sustained within an ecologically functional system.

The animal is to be hunted without artificial light source, or motorised mode of transport and in an area that does not by human design concentrate animals for a specific purpose or at a specific time, such as a water hole, salt lick or feeding station. No ethical hunter shall take female animals with dependent young.

The Zimbabwe Hunters Association (ZHA) is an example of a highly respected body that promotes the ethics of recreational hunting and insists that its members adhere to a code of conduct. This association conducts several environmental training camps that expose young potential hunters to practical hunting techniques and standards. Similar activities are conducted in Namibia, but are not well developed elsewhere in the region.

This is not to say that recreational hunting is without its problems. In countries such as Botswana and Zambia, where hunting is regarded as a “right”, the wildlife management authorities have had to deal with “citizen” hunting where little respect is paid to local licenses, and little regard is given to hunting ethics. This form of hunting has to a large extent replaced “traditional hunting” especially as local citizens have acquired the wealth and means to hunt using modern weapons and equipment. Efforts have been made to bring this form of hunting under control, but there is still considerable room for improvement.

Sport (or Safari) Hunting: The issue of “ethics” and adherence to “codes of conduct” are most difficult to apply when dealing with the commercial sport (or safari) hunting. As a general rule commercial outfitters and professional hunters prescribe to the definition of the Fair Chase, as listed above, but the Code of Conduct is usually defined in the laws and regulations governing hunting. Generally the regulations cover the following and it’s considered unethical to:

- Shoot from a vehicle, aircraft or boat
- Chase animals with a hunting vehicle
- Sport hunt animals at night
- Hunt “caged” or “canned” or captive breed animals
- Use spotting agents to locate animals
- Hunt within 500 m of a national park boundary
- Shoot pregnant female animals or those with young
- Shoot animals at drinking point, feeding station or salt lick
- Over hunt animals on any land
- Not remove bait at the end of a hunt
- Hunt animals in an inhumane way
- Lure animals with electronic calling devices, or food
- Litter a hunting area
- Cause wild fires and destroy habitats
- Pollute water resources
- Submit falsified trophy measurements
- Misrepresent the hunting opportunities in a hunting area
- Mishandle and behave irresponsibly with firearms
- Not report and/or follow up on wounded animals

The problem is that it is extremely difficult to ensure that these regulations are being strictly observed. Some wildlife agencies insist that game scouts accompany all hunts that occur on State land to ensure that these regulations are enforced. This is an extremely controversial

subject, with some outfitters and professional hunters vehemently opposed to this practice, while others have completely the opposite view. Whatever the case, the effectiveness of insisting on game scouts accompanying a hunting party is only as effective as the overall integrity of the wildlife agency and the professional outfitter and/or professional hunter. Unless the authorities are willing to enforce the regulations without favour, and ensure that the penalties are sufficiently severe to deter repeated offences, these regulations do little to regulate the industry and instil codes of conduct.

The highly competitive and lucrative nature of the commercial sport hunting industry is the key issue influencing its effective management and administration. The methods used for securing concessions, hunting suitable trophy animals or filling a hunting bag often go beyond what is considered ethical. Even though highly reputable hunting associations exist in the various countries, most of these do not have the legal authority to police their members. At worst, professional outfitter/hunter can have his/her membership withdrawn, and recommendations can be made to the authorities to impose a fine in terms of the act and regulations, but very rarely will the wildlife authority withdraw a professional outfitter or hunters license or restrict the offending person in any way.

It is also not obligatory for any outfitter/professional hunter to be a member of any professional association. To overcome this, most countries in the region insist that professional outfitters/hunters are registered with the government authority. This helps to identify the persons concerned but because of the intense competition in the industry and the pressure to “satisfy” client needs, there is often a distinct lack of peer pressure and self policing amongst the professional hunting fraternity. It is only in exceptional cases where the reputation of the outfitter/professional hunter is exposed, but for the most part, the hunting fraternity is a “closed shop”.

An added complication is that policing the industry is relatively simple if the law is applied, but far more difficult when “codes of conduct” are enforced for “unethical” behaviour. This is especially difficult in these modern times where the threat of litigation is always present. An example of a letter from the “Ethics and Code of Conduct Committee” of Safari Club International (SCI) illustrate this point (see below).

The question of “ethics” and “codes of conduct” are always hotly debated in the wildlife hunting forum. The general opinion is that the most effective way for maintaining standards is through the self-motivation of the professional outfitters/hunters themselves, and having a management authority with the highest professional standards and integrity. It is also regarded as important that the law should be vigorously applied, with severe penalties that include the withdrawal of hunting rights and privileges.

Certification of the Safari Hunting Industry

A suggestion has been made that professional outfitters and authorities be “certified” in order to set standards and improve the industry. The concept is based on a similar certification in the forestry industry developed in the 1990’s to make timber production more ecologically and socially responsible by setting comprehensive standards against which the timber industry’s can be measured.

The concept of certification of the hunting industry envisages a high profile independent board that would evaluate and provide certificates of approval on both hunting areas and

hunting outfitters. The logic for such certification is founded in the need to maintain high standards in:

Proper management of the hunting area
Professional conduct by the outfitter (and professional hunter)
Appropriate training for professional hunters.

It is envisaged that certification could operate at the level of countries, or at the level of the company or concession. To qualify, for example, would require that monitoring data are available, transparent systems are in place to allocate hunting (i.e. permits, tenders for concessions etc.) and the hunting rights of landowners are secure. Other parameters could include, for example, game populations are naturally sustained within the area or ecosystem of which the area is a part; management is in accordance with an approved management plan; hunting shall be conducted only in approved areas; hunting is within quota; baiting for predators according to acceptable methods etc. (Baldus and Cauldwell, 2005, Moss, 2005).

Virtually all of the conditions identified to achieve certification are already described either in the wildlife laws and regulations of the various Southern African countries in which hunting occurs, and/or are captured in the codes of conduct of various hunting organisations. The idea of certification is therefore not something new: it had its origins under a different name and work ethic in the formative years of safari hunting in Kenya at the beginning of the 20th century (see Parker, 2005) . The same “certification” exists today: outfitters are required to be registered, professional hunters are trained and licensed, quotas are allocated, concession areas are offered on tender and codes of conduct exist to guide the industry. The practicality of certification is therefore dismissed by some as being unworkable unless the integrity and professionalism of the hunting industry is re-established at all levels.

POLICIES, LEGISLATION AND LAND TENURE SYSTEMS

The foundation for the management and administration of the hunting industry was developed in Kenya by both the government regulating authorities and the private sector. Recreational hunting was the principal form of tourism in Kenya from 1890 until the early 1960s, after which 'motorised game viewing and package tourism' displaced it. However, Kenya banned hunting in all its forms, including problem animal control and commercial cropping in 1977, not because it had become unmanageable or unsustainable, but because the Kenya Game Department and its successor - the Wildlife Conservation and Management Department (WCMD) - became so corrupted (Parker, 2004).

The systems developed in Kenya have however been modified to meet the prevailing circumstances in Southern African countries.

Policies Applicable to Hunting in Southern Africa

Zimbabwe led the East and Southern African region in establishing wildlife policies and the legislative frameworks necessary to catalyse wildlife management not only in the Parks and Wildlife Estate, but also on private and communal lands. This progressive policy environment facilitated the diversification of the wildlife industry leading not only to increases in revenue generation and employment but also to increases in its wildlife populations. Recreational and sport hunting was integral to this success, providing high revenue returns from limited off-take that has largely financed wildlife management in many agriculturally marginal areas.

Zimbabwe

Zimbabwe's 1975 Wildlife Act and its liberal wildlife policies prior to 2000 were largely responsible for the growth and expansion of the sport hunting industry on both public and private land (Booth, 2001). However, although sport hunting continues to remain popular and is well-supported in the State-controlled Safari Areas and CAMPFIRE concessions, it has virtually collapsed as an industry on private land in the wake of the land reform programme initiated after 2001. There is however increasing awareness amongst government and policy decision makers on the importance of sport hunting not only for conserving the country's natural heritage, but also as a key economic asset that will be instrumental in safeguarding the future of the industry.

With this in mind, the Parks and Wildlife Authority has drafted the *Wildlife Based Land Reform Policy (2002)* whose vision it is to maximise livelihood options for resettled farmers, particularly those living in areas where agricultural potential is limited, by ensuring profitable, equitable and sustainable use of wildlife and other resources. In particular the policy:

Is consistent with Land Reform Programme

Recognises game ranching as a viable form of land use in Natural Regions IV and V that are subject to low and erratic rainfall.

Intent is to promote racial equity in and long-term sustainability of wildlife industry.

Intends to expand shareholding of all conservancies based on capital, assets or other inputs

Make animals available from National Parks Estate as a way of creating an asset base.

Identify settlement farms that lend themselves to Game Ranching.

Maintain the integrity of the Parks Estate.

Promote fair and equitable sharing of wildlife business with indigenous people and local communities.

This policy is still in draft form and is subject to intense debate amongst key stakeholders. It

recognises that the State will continue to make provision for wildlife outside the protected area system by setting aside core areas for wildlife production. However this policy and the new Wildlife Policy are moving away from the decentralised and minimal regulatory environment that existed prior to 2000. This has engendered a great deal of uncertainty in the future of the sport hunting industry, especially within the private sector even though the policies recognise that:

Wildlife-based land reform will contribute to greater equity of stakeholders.
Ensure that stakeholders share costs and benefits from wildlife production.
Wildlife production will be maintained where it is the most appropriate land use option.
Most profitable and ecologically sustainable land use option will be allowed to evolve in response to changing economic influences notwithstanding the need for food security.
Wildlife-based land reform can be implemented at different scales (intensive to extensive).
Management responsibility will be devolved to the most appropriate authority.
Policy recognises importance of authority, responsibility and incentive schemes in fostering viable wildlife production systems.
The benefits of Conservancies in the development of tourism are recognised.
Conservancies are recognised as viable form of wildlife-based land use and the policy is seeking ways to integrate newly resettled farmers in this system through joint venture/ partnerships between Conservancy Trusts, communities and emerging indigenous entrepreneurs.

Regulation of licenses and quotas: In terms of the Act, landowners are the custodians of all wildlife on the land, and recreational hunters are not required to purchase a license to hunt or pay any State licenses for animals hunted on private land. Similarly Rural District Council's (RDCs) are not required to pay any licenses for animals hunted in Communal Areas. The Parks and Wildlife Management Authority (PWMA) do however raise a *Licence Fee* for animals hunted within a State controlled Safari Area. International hunters are however required to be registered and approved by PWMA prior to a hunt taking place irrespective of where the hunt takes place. Furthermore, landowners were until recently not required to submit quotas to the PWMA for approval. This is now a requirement in terms of Statutory Instrument No 26 of 1998. Quotas for CAMPFIRE concessions in Communal Area also have to be approved by PWMA. The Parks authorities set quotas for all Safari Area concessions. All commercial sport hunting must be undertaken in the presence of a registered professional hunter.

Botswana

Botswana has committed approximately 17% of its land area to national parks and game reserves, and while the primary purpose of these areas is the preservation of wildlife for heritage and aesthetic values, the *Wildlife Conservation Policy of 1986* clearly states that wildlife resources must be seen in terms of their potential contribution to the economic well being of the nation. As such, Botswana promotes the entire spectrum of wildlife utilization activities in free-hold land, State land and communal land outside of protected areas. These include subsistence hunting, sport/recreational hunting, culling and cropping operations, and game ranching and farming.

In State and communal land, the ownership of wildlife is vested in the State, while the right of ownership of animals in free-hold land is vested with the private landholder provided a game-proof fence is erected around the property. In State and communal land where Botswana live with wildlife, government recognises the role wildlife plays in sustaining their livelihoods, and in order to promote wildlife as a primary land use in these areas, the *Wildlife Conservation Policy of 1986* established Wildlife Management Areas (WMAs). In these areas wildlife utilization is regarded as the primary land-use, which is in contrast to Controlled

Hunting Areas (CHAs) where licensed hunting is allowed for the benefit of the local populace, but no control exists over other land use activities that may be detrimental to wildlife populations (e.g. mining, livestock development).

The Wildlife Policy also supports the “right” rather than the “privilege” of Botswana to benefit from wildlife through sustainable use, and this forms an integral component of the country’s poverty alleviation and development programs. This policy was formalised with the enactment of the *Wildlife Conservation and National Parks Act of 1992*. This is the principle legislation relating to licensed hunting that regulates the harvest, possession, sale and trade in wildlife. It is supported by the *Unified Hunting Regulations of 1979* which outlines licensed hunting categories, fees and species allowed to be hunted. Other supporting legislation includes the *Tribal Lands Act of 1968*, which makes provision for the Tribal Lands Board to grant user rights within WMAs and CHAs, although the power to grant rights to utilise wildlife within these areas lies with the Department of Wildlife and National Parks (DWNP).

Regulation of licenses and quotas: Hunting in Botswana can be undertaken by citizens, residents and non-residents or foreign sport hunters. All Botswana citizens and resident have access to recreational hunting while subsistence hunting is available to the rural poor. All hunting occurs in CHAs that may fall within State land, communal land and WMAs. The DWNP issues licenses under a quota system known as the Recommended Allowable Off-take (RAO) quota. Licenses are sold or issued to citizens, residents and non-residents under differentiated fee structures and quotas. There are four types of licenses:

Single Game License
Small Game License (citizens only)
Bird License (citizen and non-resident)
Special Game License (eligible citizens only).

Hunting quotas and licenses are also provided to foreign sport hunting clients through safari operators, to landowners under the land-holder’s privilege permit and directly to community-managed areas in selected WMAs.

Community Wildlife Management Areas: Due to Special Game Licences not meeting their originally intended purpose, and concerns over sustainability, there has been a gradual shift from individual licensing to community management of an allocated quota. Such quotas fall within the RAO quota and are allocated in conjuncture with Community Based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM) initiatives that build the capacity of communities to effectively manage and benefit from the wildlife resource.

The need to diversify the economy and to increase the opportunities for rural communities to participate in economic activities is widely recognised in Botswana. One of the strategies is to promote tourism, especially eco-tourism, and facilitate the meaningful participation of local communities in tourism activities. In line with this are the recent developments in CBNRM in which communities are encouraged to register as Trusts or Community Based Organisations (CBOs), which facilitates the devolution of a large proportion of the revenues from wildlife to these registered Trusts. Once registered the Trust is able to enter into a Joint Venture Agreement with a commercial operator and monies for the Land Rent and the sale of the quota are paid into the Trust’s bank account by the Land Board. A more complete account of the requirements for CBOs to obtain user rights for wildlife resources is given in Rozenmeijer and van der Jagt (2000).

While there is genuine commitment from the State to assist the development of rural communities, there appears to be a reluctance to devolve authority to the local level outside

the formal administrative structures. In many ways Botswana has gone further than most countries in devolving the revenues from wildlife to the level of the community. However, the management authority remains firmly vested in the State through the DWNP. The reality on the ground is that CBNRM has not been fully devolved to and implemented at community level as this is seen as the natural preserve of the DWNP. This despite the fact that CBNRM has received considerable donor support for more than 15 years, and a draft CBNRM policy has been on the books for more than four years.

Commercial Sport Hunting Concessions: Of the 68 CHAs in Botswana, 15 CHAs that are located in State land are allocated by DWNP through lease agreements to private safari operators. All 15 CHAs under private concession are mainly used for sport hunting by foreign clients, although DWNP does ask concession holders to allocate some of their less charismatic species to citizen and resident Single Game License hunters. In the few cases where this does occur, Botswana are required to pay additional charges to concession holders. Although DWNP are responsible for allocating safari operators the right to utilise wildlife and provide the quota of animals that can be hunted, it is the Lands Board under the Ministry of Lands and Housing that is responsible for establishing lease fees and entering into contractual agreements with operators.

Game Ranch Free-hold Land Holders Privilege Permit: The *Wildlife Conservation Policy of 1986* actively supports the establishment of a wildlife utilization sector in Botswana's free-hold land through the creation of game ranches. Such support is enacted in the *Wildlife Conservation and National Parks Act, 1992*, through the *Land Holders Privilege Act (Section 20)* and through the *Game Ranching Policy for Botswana (2002)*. This Act allows ranches that have erected a game-proof fence to benefit commercially from the consumptive utilization of wildlife on their land through the issuance of a long term Commercial Land Holders Privilege Permit issued by the Director of DWNP.

Quotas are fixed and set on an annual basis, and Ranch owners or lessees may use their quota for commercial profit through sport hunting (commercial privilege permit) or for the subsistence production of game meat (subsistence/not for profit privilege permit). License fees for hunting under land holders' privilege are the same as for citizen hunting and therefore negligible.

Policy Implementation: The detailed plan of action for policy implementation is included in Botswana's *National Development Plans (NDP)* and the DWNP Strategic Plan, (2002 – 2006). NDP 9 for the period 2003/04 to 2009/2010 continues to support the economic potential of wildlife for the benefit of land holders in all land tenure systems through the sustainable application of tourism, hunting and culling/cropping wildlife uses. Specifically, there is considerable support for community-based wildlife management in WMAs, and commercial wildlife management in CHAs and free-hold land. However, even though wildlife policy is well-defined and incorporated into Botswana's national development strategy, implementation has met problems especially with regard to conflicts with other government policies such as for fencing, settlement and livestock development.

Namibia

The organisational structure of hunting in Namibia is clearly defined in the *National Conservation Ordinance No. 4 of 1975* and several policies that deal with specific aspects of wildlife utilization. However, management and administration of the wildlife resource presents special problems because of its nomadic and migratory nature. This has to a large extent been overcome by fencing off properties, but this in turn introduces additional problems such as overstocking, prevention of natural movements, fragmentation of populations, use of game fenced areas as large scale live traps by opening fences and/or

attracting animals into enclosed areas to mention a few.

Development of Conservancies: Conservancies are land units managed jointly for resource conservation purposes by multiple landholders, with financial and other benefits shared between them in some way. They occur both on private and communal land, and most aim to enhance habitat for, and numbers of, game species and draw income from consumptive and non-consumptive tourism ventures.

The development of conservancies in the commercial farm sector emerged in the early 1990s when many commercial farmers realized that due to most game species being free ranging, a co-operative and co-ordinated approach to game management and utilization was required. The first conservancy was established in 1992 and it consisted of a group of neighbouring farmers who agreed to pool their natural resources and undertake management collectively through a committee. Advantages of this approach are that greater resources can be made available towards managing a much larger area under a sustainable use approach. Currently there 24 established conservancies in the commercial sector where safari hunters from abroad enjoy unparalleled access to huge tracts of hunting land (Barnett and Patterson, *in litt.*)

Communal Areas Hunting: In contrast, Communal Area Conservancies have a shorter history and it was not until the *1996 Nature Conservation Ordinance Amendment* that Communal Area Conservancies could be formed and the full advantages of sustainable consumptive wildlife use realized. There are now 12 Communal Conservancies, and sport hunting has played a key role in ensuring their success.

Fencing of game farms and conservancies on private land: Commercial farmers in Namibia are given ownership over huntable game (oryx, springbok, kudu, warthog, buffalo and bushpig) if they have a certain size farm and a certain type of fencing. They are able, as identified landowners, to use protected and specially protected species through a permit system. Legislation also allows trophy hunting to take place on commercial farms under certain conditions. Commercial farmers may buy and sell game on their land.

Current policy provides for the registration of game fences enclosing areas of 1,000ha or larger, but does not prohibit fences constructed to contain wildlife if the owner does not wish to register such fences with the Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET). The policy also does not provide guideline for the management of such game-fenced areas or a requirement that the owners establish a management plan.

Minimum standards are prescribed for the construction and registration of game proof fences (Official Gazette 3556, 1976) for small to medium as well as large mammal species (excluding elephant). Once registered, certain privileges follow, i.e. an extension of the hunting season to four rather than two months for unfenced areas, provided that fenced areas are 1,000ha or larger, as well as relaxed control over the level of off takes for live capture or meat production

Two types of fences are recognized: a 1.2m high fence for species which usually crawl underneath an obstacle (e.g. hartebeest, gemsbok) and a 2.3m high fence for species which usually jump over obstacles (e.g. kudu, eland). Compulsory “jackal-proof” fencing of the small stock farming area in the south of the country to control predators, as prescribed under agricultural legislation, serves in effect as a third type of game fence for species such as springbok. Once fences have been constructed, they are supposed to be maintained intact, and it is an offence to make unauthorized openings in fences or create funnels for the purpose of capturing animals or luring them into enclosed areas.

The Ordinance therefore attempts to regulate the types of fences that may be constructed and

the minimum area of land that can be enclosed, however it is also recognised that monitoring and regulating this policy is extremely difficult. The policy is therefore advocating for greater deregulation of the requirements so as to encourage landowners to engage in wildlife based activities and thus play a more significant role in biodiversity protection.

Wildlife, Management, Utilisation and Tourism in Communal Areas: The objectives of the policy is to establish an economically based system for the management and utilisation of wildlife and other renewable living resources on communal land so that rural communities can participate on a partnership basis with MET and other Ministries in the management of, and benefits from, natural resources, including rural development based on wildlife.

The policy also redresses the past discriminatory policies and practices which gave substantial rights over wildlife to commercial farmers, but which ignored communal farmers. The amendment of the Nature Conservation Ordinance (4 of 1975) extends the same principles that govern rights to wildlife utilisation on commercial land to communal land. The policy on wildlife and tourism on communal land therefore makes provision for rural communities, which form a conservancy to be given the same rights over wildlife as a commercial farmer.

The Nature Conservation Amendment Act, 1996 (Act 5 of 1996) has amended the Nature Conservation Ordinance so that residents of communal areas can gain the same rights over wildlife and tourism as commercial farmers. Instead of fencing and the size of the farm as conditions for gaining ownership over huntable game and the right to use other species, the Nature Conservation Amendment Act sets the formation of a conservancy as the condition upon which ownership and use rights over game are given to communal area residents. According to the Act any group of persons residing on communal land may apply to the Minister of Environment and Tourism to have the area they inhabit or part of that area declared a conservancy. The Minister will declare a conservancy in the Government Gazette if:

The community applying has elected a representative committee and supplied the names of the committee members.

The community has agreed upon a legal constitution, which provides for the sustainable management and utilisation of game in the conservancy.

The conservancy committee has the ability to manage funds.

The conservancy committee has an approved method for the equitable distribution to members of the community of benefits derived from the consumptive and non-consumptive use of game in the conservancy.

The community has defined the boundaries of the geographic area of the conservancy.

The area concerned is not subject to any lease or is not a proclaimed game reserve or nature reserve.

Once a conservancy has been declared and gazetted, the Act gives the conservancy committee, on behalf of the community in the conservancy, "rights and duties" with regard to the consumptive and non-consumptive use and sustainable management of game. The rights over wildlife conferred on a conservancy committee are for the ownership (and therefore use for own purposes) of huntable game, the capture and sale of game, hunting and culling, and the right to apply for permits for the use of protected and specially protected game. If a conservancy applies to become designated as a 'hunting farm', trophy hunting (including of protected and specially protected game) can take place on the conservancy.

The Nature Conservation Amendment Act, 1996, also makes provision for communal area residents who do not form conservancies to benefit indirectly from wildlife, through the formation of Wildlife Councils. A Wildlife Council is established by the Minister after consulting with a local community or communities on communal land. The area covered by

a Wildlife Council may not include any conservancy, any land subject to a lease or any proclaimed game park or nature reserve. A Wildlife Council will gain the same rights, and obligations concerning consumptive and non-consumptive use of wildlife as a conservancy.

In order to give more precise definition to certain issues relating to the formation of conservancies and Wildlife Councils, the MET introduced new Regulations to accompany the Nature Conservation Amendment Act, 1996. The new regulations require a conservancy committee to provide a register containing the names, identification numbers and addresses of the members of the community to be represented by the committee. The new regulations also specify certain issues that must be covered by the Conservancy Constitution:

The objectives of the conservancy, including the sustainable management and utilisation of game within the conservancy in accordance with a game management and utilisation plan, and the equitable distribution of the benefits derived there from

The procedure for election and removal of members of the conservancy committee

The powers and responsibilities of the conservancy committee, including powers to enter into agreements relating to consumptive and non-consumptive use of game

Provisions relating to the holding of meetings of the committee, annual and ordinary meetings of the conservancy and the recording of proceedings of these meetings

The criteria and procedure for being recognised as a member of the conservancy, provided that no-one may be excluded on the grounds of ethnicity or gender

The rights and obligations of members of the conservancy

The procedure for members of the conservancy to decide on the policy to be followed by the conservancy committee in the equitable distribution of benefits

Provision for the management of the conservancy's finances, including the appointment of a suitably qualified person to act as treasurer, the keeping of proper accounts, and the opening of a bank account in the name of the conservancy

A procedure for dispute resolution

A procedure for the amendment of the constitution

Any other issues the conservancy may wish to include in its constitution

The regulations also provide more detail about the establishment of Wildlife Councils. In order to form a Wildlife Council, the Minister must hold a meeting in order to inform the community concerned and to consult the community about the functions and objectives of the proposed Wildlife Council. In order to hold such a meeting, the Minister must give notice of the meeting at the Office of the Regional Council, and in one newspaper circulating in the area in question. The Minister may establish a Wildlife Council if he or she is satisfied that the community, together with a Wildlife Council, has the ability to manage and utilise in a sustainable manner the game in the area covered by the council. Wildlife Councils will be composed of:

The governor of the region in which the Wildlife Council has been established, or the governor's nominee

Two staff members in the Ministry of Environment and Tourism designated by the Minister

Five other members appointed by the Minister, of whom one shall be nominated by the traditional authority for the area in which the wildlife council has been established, and of whom four shall be persons nominated by members of the community for which the council has been established.

The regulations also provide for regular meetings of the council, and the procedure at these meetings. The regulations state that the Minister will determine how moneys received by a Wildlife Council will be spent, and that no funds of the council, except for operational costs, may be expended or distributed without the Minister's approval.

Licensing of Hunting: Licensed hunting in Namibia includes trophy motivated sport hunting by foreign clients, recreational (*biltong*) hunting which is mainly meat motivated and undertaken by residents and neighbouring South Africans and landowners own hunting for game meat production and use. The declared sport hunting season is from 1st February to 31st November, whilst the *biltong* hunting season is usually through May to end August (four months) for commercial farms with registered game-proof fences, and June to July (two months) for farms with non-registered fences.

Recreational and Trophy (or Sport) hunting is controlled by a permit system. One permit per hunter is issued per hunting season. A recreational hunting permit allows the holder to hunt three “small” game (i.e. Springbok and Warthog) and two “large game” (i.e. kudu and Gemsbok) during the season. A Trophy Hunting Permit is required by a hunting client prior to the start of the hunt (for cheetah and leopard an additional hunting permit has to be obtained prior to the start of the hunt).

The following is required regarding permits for trophy hunting:

- Permits must be issued prior to the hunt commencing;
- A separate permit must be issued for each individual hunting client;
- An extra, special permit is required for the large cats (leopard, cheetah, and lion). It contains an additional list of conditions;
- A permit must be completed in full by the hunting client and the hunting professional (wounded or lost animals must also be indicated on the permit);
- Permits are issued by the MET only; and
- A maximum of two trophies per species may be harvested, per hunting client, per permit.

The legislation requires that commercial sport hunting must be undertaken in the presence of one of three types of qualified hunting guides.

Hunting guides (HG) may only conduct hunts on their own farm(s), duly registered as a hunting farm(s).

Master hunting guides (MHG) may only conduct hunts on their own farm(s) duly registered, plus two additional duly registered hunting farms.

Professional hunters (PH) may conduct hunts on all farms, provided they have written permission from the owner of the property independent of whether the farm is registered or not.

PH with big-game licence. Only these PH's may conduct hunts with guests for elephant, rhinoceros, buffalo and lion.

Bow hunting. Only hunting guides/ master hunting guides/ professional hunters in possession of a valid bow hunting licence may conduct bow hunting and guide bow hunters.

A considerable variety of species can be hunted in Namibia and are classified as either as “Specially Protected Game” due to their scarcity, “Protected Game Species” due to their scarcity and usefulness, and “Huntible Game” due to their abundance. Individually selected species from all categories can be hunted under permit depending on their particular circumstances. For instance, elephant and more recently black rhino are regarded as specially protected species according to the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES), can be hunted under quota.

Zambia

The development of the sport hunting industry in Zambia closely mirrored that of Zimbabwe in its early stages. Recreational sport hunting was started in 1950 under a government

sponsored safari hunting scheme. Hunting was conducted in Game Management Areas (GMAs) that form part of reserve or trust land which is communally owned, and acted as buffers to the protected areas. However unlike Zimbabwe, the Zambia wildlife authorities did not establish areas equivalent to “safari areas”. Instead the Zambia National Parks and Wildlife Service continued to allocate hunting blocks within the GMAs. This was possible because between 1950 and 1978 the safari industry was dominated by only two safari companies, which later increased to four companies that remained active until 1983 (Saiwana, 1995). However the demise of the Zambian economy in the 1980’s and 1990’s led to the collapse of the safari industry culminating in it being banned in 2000.

It has now been resuscitated under the Zambia Wildlife Authority (ZAWA), and while ZAWA has done much to improve the professionalism and simplicity of the existing system, the historical shortcomings in its management and administration still exist. In addition, ZAWA is also grappling with policy issues regarding community involvement in the management and administration of the Game Management Areas, especially where this is related to sport hunting. The key issue here is that as a parastatal ZAWA is reliant on the GMAs for a large portion of its operational income. Devolving full authority to local communities is therefore a hotly debated subject, with ZAWA examining a number of options to resolve this issue, including the possibility of re-classifying some protected areas in order to accommodate sport hunting.

Tanzania

The policy and legislation regulating hunting in Tanzania has evolved over the last 115 years. In the 1920s when wildlife was widespread and plentiful, the sport hunter was given a generous quota on his/her annual license, comprising 268 animals of 39 species (including two black rhino), which he/she could shoot in any area except in the Game Reserves. In the early 1950s, the Tanganyika Game Department introduced a fee for each animal shot, and declared 90 Game Controlled Areas (GCAs) to preserve important wildlife areas (Lamprey 1995). In the years following independence in 1961, the Game Department opened up the GCAs to regular hunting to increase earnings from wildlife, and in 1965 tourist hunting was permitted in the Game Reserves, beginning with the Selous Game Reserve (SGR), which was divided into 47 hunting blocks (Nicholson, 1974).

However, political changes in the early 1970s that took place in Tanzania led to a complete ban on sport hunting in 1973. The underlying reason for this drastic action was to nationalise the industry, and “Tourist” hunting was reopened in 1978 under control of the Tanzania Wildlife Corporation (TAWICO), a government parastatal. By 1988, massive corruption and incompetent management by TAWICO was evident, and the management of hunting was removed from them and placed once again with the Wildlife Division. Tanzania now has the largest hunting industry in Africa with over 130 hunting concessions covering an area in excess of 250,000 km² that are leased to outfitters licensed to conduct safari hunting. More than 60 species can be hunted on a hunting license, and hunting plays an important role in the economic development of many remote areas (Baldus and Cauldwell, 2004).

The primary legislation controlling hunting in Tanzania is the Wildlife Conservation Act of 1974, the Wildlife Conservation (Tourist Hunting) Regulations of 2000 and the Wildlife Policy of 1998. In terms of these documents, all aspects hunting in Tanzania is firmly under the central control of the Wildlife Division (WD), although the Wildlife Policy makes it possible for communities to organise themselves into Authorised Associations (AAs) and obtain the rights to control and manage all biological resources, including game, in Wildlife Management Areas (see below).

The Tourist Hunting Regulations apply to all hunting companies and authorised associations wishing to conduct tourist hunting in Tanzania. The Regulations outline the procedures for application and allocation of hunting blocks (qualifications, application, contents, non-refundable fees and registration), and the conditions and restrictions relating to hunting blocks (payment of annual fees, duration, cancellation, restrictions and permit requirements).

The Retention Scheme: A retention scheme enables approximately 50% of the income generated within a Game Reserve to remain with the Reserve. A complex breakdown of the income has been developed whereby the funds are shared between the Reserve, the Tanzanian Wildlife Protection Fund and Treasury of the Central Government, then back to the Wildlife Division and to District Councils in which tourist hunting fees are generated. The breakdown is illustrated below in Figure 1 with a comparison to the disbursement of funds where retention schemes do not exist (data from Cauldwell, 2004).

This system was first negotiated for the Selous Game Reserve (SGR) in 1992 and first implemented in 1994. It is now applied to other Game Reserves in the country, and is the method used to generate capital and operating funds for these Reserves.



Figure 1: Disbursement of funds generated in a Game Reserve to the Tanzanian Wildlife Protection Fund and the Government Treasury where retention schemes exist, and a comparison for areas where retention schemes do not exist

Land Tenure, “Ownership” of Wildlife and the Hunting Industry

The issue of land tenure and the “ownership” of wildlife are of key importance to the sport hunting industry and how it has developed in Southern Africa since the 1960’s. Generally the overall responsibility for the protection and conservation of wildlife rests with the government, and various governments apply varying degrees of control over how wildlife may be used depending on the land tenure systems that apply. The level of control may be minimal, as is the case in Zimbabwe and Namibia, or extensive powers are conferred upon the wildlife agency to define hunting seasons, levels of off take and hunting regulations as is the case in Tanzania. The various land tenure system and their impact on the management of hunting in Southern and Eastern Africa are discussed below.

Hunting Systems on State Land

To accommodate hunting on State Land, the various Southern African countries have classified hunting areas as:

Controlled Hunting Areas (CHA)
Game Management Areas (GMA)
Wildlife Management Areas (WMA)
Safari Areas (SA)

The level of protection and control by the management authorise in each of these areas depends on their status in terms of the respective conservation legislation and land use classification. Usually Controlled Hunting Areas are afforded the lowest status, and Safari Areas are afforded the highest status.

Controlled Hunting Areas (CHA): These are relatively large areas that evolved from the Tsetse Controlled Hunting era of the 1960’s in Southern Africa and much earlier in East Africa. They were usually sparsely populated and did not hold significant wildlife populations, primarily because they included several alternative forms of land use, notably livestock production and subsistence agriculture.

Controlled Hunting Areas were a feature of the Botswana hunting system where annual hunting quotas were allocated allowing citizens to purchase licenses to hunt a wide variety of animals. The boundaries of these CHAs have since been re-aligned so as to correspond to 11 Wildlife Management Areas (WMAs) that surround the national parks.

CHAs are also known as “Game Control Areas” or “Open Areas” and are a feature of the Tanzanian hunting system. There are, however, initiatives to redefine some of these areas as Wildlife Management Areas (see below).

Game Management Areas (GMA): Game Management Areas are a feature of the Zambian hunting system. Their purpose was to establish a buffer between a national park and human settlements. As with CHAs, wildlife management is not the primary form of land use in these areas and has to compete with livestock production and agriculture. The land is either Reserve Land or Trust Land or both, and is commonly owned by the tribes who reside on it. The consent of the chief or chiefs is required before the land can be designated as a Game Management Area, and hunting by citizens, residents and non-residents is permitted.

Following the ban on safari hunting in 2000, a new system was introduced under the control of the Zambian Wildlife Authority (ZAWA) in which 44 hunting concessions in 32 Game Management Areas were offered on tender. These hunting blocks are classified into three

categories (prime, secondary and under-stocked) on the basis of trophy animal densities, species diversity and distribution.

Wildlife Management Areas (WMA): Wildlife Management Areas (WMAs) differ from CHAs and GMAs in that wildlife utilisation is the primary form of land use. This concept is best developed in Botswana where, in terms of land tenure, the WMAs are State land as opposed to CHAs which are communal land. The creation of WMAs paved the way for rural communities to manage and benefit from wildlife directly through sustainable utilization, and a CBNRM programme was established in the early 1990s to facilitate this process. WMAs in Botswana also perform the role of acting as buffer zones for the parks and reserves and as migratory corridors for wildlife moving from one area to another. For each WMA the Botswana Department of Wildlife and National Parks (DWNP) developed appropriate regulations that facilitate the implementation of a policy of sustained wildlife utilisation that is centred on:

- Community managed wildlife utilisation
- Community managed wildlife utilisation in livestock areas
- Commercial wildlife utilisation (leasehold)
- Non-hunting/photographic areas
- Multiple purpose areas

These include hunting, game ranching and farming, live capture and venison production. These areas also encourage the development of non-consumptive tourism in areas where this is the most appropriate form of land use. WMAs are offered on tender to the private sector. Detailed management plans that describe the joint venture arrangements with local communities are required to secure a concession in these areas.

The concept of WMA's is also being developed in Tanzania on a pilot basis and has evolved from the experience gained in Zimbabwe, Zambia, Botswana and Namibia as well as from the experience in relation to forest management in Tanzania. Initially it was envisaged that the WMAs would replace Game Controlled Areas or Open Areas, but only if they could support significant wildlife populations and/or if villagers were willing to manage their land to support wildlife.

These early proposals that subsequently culminated in the 1998 Wildlife Policy of Tanzania stipulated that villages should first be given title deed to village land so that villagers could decide (with appropriate professional advice) which form of land use, compatible with the conservation of natural resources, they wish to pursue, and how they will derive benefits from such management. It was envisaged that through this sense of custodianship over wildlife that villagers would take responsibility for wildlife (and other resources) and thus reduce the levels of illegal exploitation.

A process of preparing WMA guidelines went through comprehensive and intricate participatory processes. The major stumbling block was the need to amend the Wildlife Conservation Act of 1974 to incorporate the 1998 policy since the Act did not support the concept of community-based wildlife management. To overcome this, the Wildlife Division agreed to convert the WMA guidelines into regulations - the *Wildlife Conservation (Wildlife Management Areas) Regulations of December 2002*. In terms of these regulations 16 pilot WMA initiatives are being developed, mostly with donor support. While these initiatives have been welcomed, there is still a level of uncertainty regarding these regulations, and the level of commitment by the Tanzanian authorities to implement and support the WMA concept. The areas of concern include:

The Act is still to be amended to recognise this radical shift in natural resource management.

The extent to which communities are able to draw benefit from the WMA is still unclear. The policy strategy is for the State to retain all ownership of and overall responsibility for management of wildlife resources.

The level of taxes, fees and levies drawn from the potential revenue remain unclear.

The regulations make it clear that the WMA's will remain largely under the control of the Wildlife Division with the rights to land and other resources unclear, as is benefit sharing.

Safari Areas (SA): Safari Areas are a feature of the National Parks and Wildlife Authority (NPWA) hunting system in Zimbabwe, and evolved from Controlled Hunting Areas set up to act as buffer zones surrounding the National Parks Estate. These areas are afforded the same level of protection as the national parks of Zimbabwe. The only difference being that they provide opportunities to the public for camping, hunting, fishing, photography, viewing of animals and other tourist associated activities. No other form of land use is permitted in these areas such as livestock production, forestry, human settlement or agriculture.

The main demand for these areas is from the safari industry because they are the prime source of big game. The NPWA allocate annual quotas for these areas and these are then offered on tender and/or open auction to commercial safari operators on 3 - 5 year lease agreements.

Hunting on other land

Hunting systems that have developed on private and other land (e.g. Forest and Communal areas) in Zambia, Namibia and Botswana are usually under the control of the responsible wildlife agency. The exception to this being Zimbabwe which has probably the most liberal legislation in this regard.

Private Land: Sport and recreational hunting on private land is best developed in Namibia and South Africa and until recently in Zimbabwe. A limited amount of game ranching occurs on private land in Zambia and Botswana.

Zimbabwe: In Zimbabwe sport hunting on private land is controlled by the landowner and forms an integral part of Zimbabwe's conservation policy which encouraged decentralisation of responsibility and accountability for wildlife management to both private, parastatal (Forestry and Agricultural) and communal landowners. However the recent upheaval brought about by the controversial Land Reform Programme initiated in 2000 by the government has seen an almost complete breakdown of this system. The few game ranching properties and Conservancies that remain unaffected by the Land Reform Programme continue to operate as before where the landowner is in control of all wildlife management activities.

All revenue from wildlife utilisation (sport hunting concession and trophy fees or ecotourism) accrues directly to the landowner, and not to government (the government receives income through taxes etc.) i.e. the landowner has the *right to hunt and sell animals that occur on the property*. The NPWA does not require the landowners to monitor animal populations nor does it require landowners to pay any form of licence fee. However, recently introduced legislation now requires that quotas on private game ranches have to be approved by the NPWA.

Namibia: Namibia is divided into three forms of land tenure, with approximately 45% in the south and centre of the country being privately-owned commercial farmland, 40% being State-owned communal land mainly in the north, with the remaining 15% being proclaimed State land designated mainly for conservation (national parks, nature reserves and protected areas) and mining. Private commercial land is divided into approximately 6,300 properties

of about 7,000 hectares each where livestock production is the primary form of land use. A large number of these properties have been converted to game farms/ranches. The MET requires that these property owners fence the game farm to set standards, and that the properties are inspected by officials in order to approve off take quotas.

Botswana: In Botswana, the development of game ranching on private land has been impeded by the prevailing land tenure system. The game ranches that do exist are confined to the few freehold livestock ranches, and leasehold ranches established under the 1975 TGLP. The *Game Ranching Policy for Botswana of 2002* however actively encourages the development of game ranching, and it is envisaged that the implementation of the *1991 National Policy on Agricultural Development* will lead to a major shift from communal landownership in the tribal areas to leasehold ownership and thus offer further opportunities for the development of game ranching on Tribal Land.

Parastatal Land: The Zimbabwe Forestry Commission regards itself as a multi-land use agency with emphasis on resource management. Several of the Forest Areas border on the national parks estate and thus support significant wildlife populations. The Commission has taken advantage of this and operates one of the largest safari companies in Zimbabwe. Similarly the Agricultural Development Authority (ADA) and the Cold Storage Commission (CSC) have a number of commercial properties throughout Zimbabwe where the wildlife potential has been developed. Usually this involves negotiating the hunting rights with private operators or organisations such as the Zimbabwe Hunters Association (ZHA).

Communal Land – Community Based Natural Resource Management: The Communal Areas Management Programme for Indigenous Resources (CAMPFIRE) in Zimbabwe has simulated a wide variety of wildlife related activities in Communal Lands since 1989 throughout Southern and Eastern Africa. In Zimbabwe this has been made possible by granting Appropriate Authority (AA) status to Rural District Councils (RDCs) that have satisfied the Minister that they are capable of managing their wildlife resources. This allows the RDCs to use the wildlife as they wish, but invariably they lease the right to hunt in Communal Lands to safari outfitters as concessions as this is the most lucrative option. Income generated through joint venture lease agreements is then shared with the RDC and local community members. Under this system, the authority to manage and administer wildlife resources in the Communal Land has not been devolved to the lowest level, as is the case in Namibia.

The development of the policies and legislation, which gave effect to Namibia's Community Based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM) approach, took place within a context of development of local projects and the reform of policy and legislation in tandem (see Section 3.1.3).

The Namibian approach is probably the most liberal of all the CBC initiatives in the region. Government actively encourages rural communities to embark upon wildlife based initiatives, and has facilitated the process so that as many rural communities as possible may benefit fully from their wildlife resources. The process is not without its inherent problems (boundary disputes etc.) but there is a positive forum between government, communities and facilitating NGOs to resolve these when they arise.

The Community Hunting Areas (CHAs) forms the basis of much of the CBNRM effort in Botswana. These are designated blocks of land within a WMA that are zoned with a pre-designated form of resource management. Some CHAs are leased directly to the private sector. However, the joint directive from the Ministry of Commerce and Industry (which then housed the DWNP) and the Ministry of Local Government, Lands and Housing set out the minimum conditions that a community must meet before it could be awarded the *Head*

Lease or quota from the DWNP or a resource use lease for any tourism or hunting development activity from a Land Board for that area. In order to obtain this the community must establish a *representative, accountable and legal entity* (RALE). This must have a constitution and a board of trustees. RALEs are effectively Community Based Organisations (CBOs) or Trusts to which the benefits (quota fee and land rent) from wildlife are paid. The key issue here is that the community does not have direct access to the management and administration of the wildlife resources. This is still firmly held by the DWNP.

In Tanzania, the process of gaining access to wildlife resources is through the establishment of a Wildlife Management Area. The process is defined in the WMA regulations and involves several complicated and bureaucratic steps that overload the communities involved. This includes the establishment of a CBO with approved constitution, preparation and approval of village land use plans, preparation and approval of general management plans for the WMA, including an approved boundary description and application to the Wildlife Division for Authorised Association status. Currently 16 pilot WMAs are being developed under a three year programme but none have yet been approved.

The “Ownership” of Wildlife

The “ownership” of wildlife and the status of the land on which it occurs has an important bearing on the administration and management of the hunting industry, whether this is recreational hunting or sport hunting. Wildlife in law generally has the status of *res nullis*, i.e. wildlife is owned by nobody. The law simply recognises the rights of landholders, including the State, to use, manage and benefit from wildlife on their land.

The interpretation of this in the various countries in the region has been to vest the “ownership” of all wildlife in the Head of State, and then provide a government (or parastatal) wildlife agency with the mandate to protect and conserve the wildlife through the implementation of policies, laws and regulations promulgated for this purpose.

In terms of the sport hunting industry, the degree to which the policy and legal environment is applied determines its success. The most stringent example of the application of these laws is where all land is regarded as State Land, and all wildlife is owned by the State and is under the direct control of the wildlife authority (e.g. Tanzania, Botswana). Gaining access to wildlife under these circumstances can be extremely difficult as it usually involves securing various licences either from the wildlife authority or from local officials at the district level.

Other countries have adopted less stringent policies. In Zambia, for example, game ranching on freehold land has been developed, although the landowner is still required to obtain licences and permits from the wildlife authority. However direct access to wildlife resources within the GMAs is still not possible since the policy prevents the establishment of private sector-driven game ranching enterprises in these areas. Similarly communities are restricted to concession agreements in which the benefits are shared with the wildlife authority, ZAWA. The incentive to engage in wildlife-based enterprises is therefore low, with communities adopting alternative land use options such as tobacco and cotton production.

Namibia has relaxed its policies in this regard even further, encouraging the private sector to develop wildlife-based enterprises, although the State still has a say in the type of game that can be hunted and the size of the properties that are permitted to undertake game ranching. Namibia is also implementing policies that encourage local communities to form Conservancies in which the community is the primary beneficiary.

In Botswana, where there is limited freehold land, access to wildlife resources is still under the control of the wildlife authorities, however, the establishment of community management

areas within the WMAs has paved the way for communities to benefit from wildlife but government has not fully devolved access rights to the communities for the wildlife.

In Zimbabwe, the policy and legal environment promotes wildlife as a sustainable form of land use, especially on private land that occurs in regions prone to drought. Landowners are free to utilise the wildlife on their land provided that this privilege was not abused, although there is now a requirement for private landowners to submit quotas for approval by the Wildlife Authority.

Implementing similar strategies in the Communal Lands in Zimbabwe was more complicated, but was achieved through the CAMPFIRE programme. However, although this programme is deemed to be successful, its fundamental flaw is that the authority to use wildlife is vested with the Rural District Council and not at the “grass roots” level. As a result there is a tendency to centralise the administration and management of wildlife utilisation at the District level, with decreasing benefits reaching the individual communities at a village and household level. Individuals in a Communal Land are not able to hunt nor can they purchase any licenses that would allow them to hunt.

“Ownership” of wildlife and land tenure is therefore fundamental to developing a successful hunting industry. It has been demonstrated that the wildlife industry will thrive where individuals or discrete entities at a community level have direct access to the land and the wildlife that occurs on it. Attempting to impose controls on how wildlife is managed often tends to remove the incentives to conserve the resource and encourage the adoption of alternative economic strategies. Determining the checks and balances to manage and administer the wildlife resource under these circumstances is therefore the key challenge facing wildlife authorities.



BEST PRACTICE NORMS AND STANDARDS REGULATING HUNTING IN SOUTHERN AFRICA

There are major differences amongst the various SADC countries where hunting is conducted that hamper direct comparisons of management and administrative strategies. For example, hunting in Tanzania is characterised by large open areas and concessions supporting recreational hunting, big game safaris, state control over all wildlife and a rigid centralised management and administrative system. In contrast, hunting in Namibia is characterised by its desert environment, heavy involvement of the private sector on privately owned game farms and establishment of innovative conservancy community programmes. Identifying the best practices and norms governing the management and administration of the hunting industry is therefore difficult since many variables and exceptions exist.

Recreational Hunting: Management and Administration

The management and administration of recreational hunting in the Southern African countries varies considerably depending on the policies and legislation. In general, recreational hunting attempts to meet the needs of citizen and resident hunters, and is usually controlled through some form of permit system. Depending on the capacity of the wildlife agencies, these systems also vary in their level of sophistication. Examples of the management and administration of these systems is provided below.

Tanzania

Numerous hunting concessions are distributed throughout the country either in Game Reserves, Game Controlled Areas or Open Areas. Resident hunting is allowed in Tanzania but is restricted to open areas. Resident hunting permits are issued by District Game Officers for their own district, and cover a variety of common game species such as impala, hartebeest, topi, buffalo and game birds. Two fee structures are applied, for Tanzanian citizens and residents respectively. The fees are low and the income generated from resident hunting is minimal and provides no economic return to the areas where resident hunting takes place. There is no effective supervision, and it is generally accepted that the system is widely misused.

Zimbabwe

Given that user rights over nearly all species of wildlife were transferred to large-scale commercial farmers under the 1975 Parks and Wildlife Act, and that few restrictions were placed on the use of the wildlife, informal recreational hunting was a common practice. Abuse of this privilege was controlled through Intensive Conservation Area (ICA) committees comprised of local farmers. The ICA was mandated to monitor and discipline farmers that neglected or abused their land. For wildlife, they were empowered to mediate in disputes between landowners, and if necessary to set quotas and impose restrictions on its use. Only as a last resort did the ICA revert to the National Parks authority to enforce locally agreed wildlife management strategies or the Parks and Wildlife Act. The landowners were thus responsible for the sustainable use of the wildlife in their respective districts.

This privilege was not extended to residents in Communal Areas. Instead the authority to hunt was vested in the Rural District Council and implemented through CAMPFIRE. Local residents are not permitted to hunt, and no facility exists that allows any form of recreational (or subsistence) hunting in a communal area.

Zimbabwe Hunters Association: A more formal recreational hunting system is implemented by the Zimbabwe Hunters Association (ZHA), a non-profit organisation that caters for citizen

hunters. The ZHA had a long standing arrangement with the Parks and Wildlife Authority in which the Association had access to several safari areas. Under this arrangement, the ZHA was granted hunting rights for its members, and paid an amount equivalent to 75% of the government trophy fees for all animals shot on these concessions (no concession fee was paid). This discount was offered on the understanding that the ZHA offered subsidised hunting to its members, and assumed all responsibility for the management and administration of the areas under its control. The hunting was allocated by draw, for which the ZHA members bought tickets as they wished. Regardless of how many tickets were purchased, a ZHA member could only conduct one hunt per annum, and one elephant hunt every three years. The successful member paid the full government trophy fee to the ZHA for the animals allocated to the hunt, and a camp levy. The “profit” from the hunt was used to recompense ZHA for its costs of managing the concession, and to offset the costs of an education camp for school children. Members of the ZHA volunteer their time to operate these camps.

The Parks and Wildlife Authority have since withdrawn from this arrangement and have leased these safari areas to the private sector. The ZHA now secures hunting for its members on the few remaining game ranches. It still runs its education camps.

The Parks and Wildlife Authority also offered recreational hunting in the Charara and Makuti Safari Areas. This hunting was open to all Zimbabwe citizens and operated along similar lines to that of the ZHA i.e. tickets could be purchased and hunts were drawn and allocated to the successful winners. “Impala” hunts were also offered on public tender in the Nyakasanga section of the Urungwe Safari Area.

Zambezi Valley Auction Hunts: The auction of big game hunts in the Zambezi Valley is unique to Zimbabwe. These hunts are keenly sort by both local, regional (mostly South African) and international hunters since they do not require that a professional hunter be present.

In all the Parks and Wildlife Authority offers 74 hunting camps of 10- and 14-day duration (42 in Nyakasanga and 32 in Sapi). Each camp is allocated to a specific site and for a set period. For example, the Mangwende Camp located in the Nyakasanga Section can accommodate 9 camps between May and September. Hunt N1 is from 1st May – 14th May; Hunt N2 is from May 18th – May 31st etc. Attached to each camp is a bag of trophy animals that varies in make up but usually contains a buffalo bull and/or cow and a selection of plains games (impala, warthog, duiker etc.). In addition to these animals, the successful purchaser of a camp (only one per hunting party) can then participate in a separate auction for additional key trophies such as elephant bulls, leopard, lion, buffalo as well as a variety of plains game (waterbuck, bushbuck, zebra, hippo etc.) thus allowing the successful bidder to tailor his/her hunt to suit their needs. All hunts are accompanied by a game scout provided by the PWMA.

PWMA appoints a commercial auctioneer to manage and conduct the auction. A Prospectus provides a detailed description of the terms and conditions of the auction as well as how and when the hunt is to be conducted. The quota allocated to each camp and the dates of the specific camp is provided, together with the selling price from the previous year. These prospectuses are widely distributed throughout the world in the months preceding the auction that is held in March each year.

The auctioning of the Zambezi Valley Hunting Camps were originally developed in the 1980's to provide the (then) Department of National Parks and Wild Life Management (DNPWLM) with a tool to monitor the value of sport hunting. Although not strictly

comparable, the data to emerge from these auctions assisted the government in determining license fees for trophy animals offered elsewhere in its Safari Areas.

Botswana

As discussed above, hunting is regarded as a right and not a privilege in Botswana. Recreational hunting is therefore widely practiced and is controlled through a variety of licenses.

Single Game License: These licenses are issued to citizens and residents of Botswana on a single animal basis and allocated to a specific area. Licenses are awarded through an annual raffle that is held at each of the DWNP districts. Single Game License fees are very low. For example, DWNP license fees for buffalo at US\$5.00 are ridiculously low compared to the US \$2,500 in license and trophy fees offered by commercial safari operators.

Due to the less lucrative nature of citizen and resident Single Game License hunting, most quotas tend to be restricted to less charismatic species that occur in less biodiverse areas. Most of the key species (elephant, lion, buffalo etc.) are allocated to foreign hunters. Citizen hunters are generally allocated more prolific species such as duiker, steenbok and kudu for *biltong* and meat production. In an effort to continue providing Single Game License hunting to Botswana, DWNP often insists on private concession holders giving a proportion of their quota to Single Game License holders. In effect, however, such arrangements are informal and, where they do occur, only the excess and less charismatic species are offered at the end of the foreign sport hunting season. Such disparity between the species and hunting areas offered to Single Game License hunters compared to private concession foreign hunters often leads to dissatisfaction amongst citizen hunters.

Small Game License: Small Game Licenses are mainly issued to citizens in the south-western districts of Kgalagadi and Kweneng where they often play an important role in the livelihoods of many rural poor. As such, license fees are low and include species such as Cape Fox, Caracal, Monitor Lizard, Bat-eared Fox, Genet, Cape Hare, Springhare and African Wild Cat.

Bird License: Bird Licenses are available to all citizens, residents and non-residents although at differentiated fee structures. The length of validity can be for one year (maximum of three months for non-residents) and potential off-take is high with more than 10 birds allowed to be hunted each day for 11 species.

Special Game License: Special Game Licenses are catered for under the *Unified Hunting Regulations*, which aim to effectively utilise Botswana's hunting resource for the betterment of the people. Remote Area Dwellers (RADs) specifically benefit from the issuance of free Special Game Licenses, which are intended to legitimise subsistence hunting by these traditional hunter/gatherer societies. Each license allows the hunting of 30 duiker, two Gemsbok, 30 Steenbok, three Warthog, one kudu, four Springhare, 50 Bat-eared Fox, 50 African Wild Cat, 10 Cape Fox, 10 Caracal, four Monitor Lizard, and unlimited numbers of Black-backed Jackal.

Since their introduction, however, Special Game Licenses have been open to abuse. Specifically, the subsidised nature of the subsistence license when compared to lucrative prices offered by recreational hunters for the same species has led to rampant misuse of the licenses. Although field officers of the Remote Area Development Programme are responsible for identifying eligible RADs for the issuance of Special Game Licenses by DWNP, regulation and enforcement on their use has been problematic. Abuse of Special Game Licenses includes overshooting and allowing other sport motivated hunters to shoot

the license quota in return for meat or money.

Zambia

ZAWA has developed procedures and guidelines for recreational (resident) and commercial (non-resident) hunting within the GMAs. These guidelines define the hunting period and regulations governing recreational hunting that can be summarised as follows:

National Recreational Hunting: Recreational hunting by Zambian residents is regulated through National Resident Hunting Licenses issued by ZAWA. Hunters request hunting access in a selection of GMAs and Open Areas, with a stipulated quota of plains game. Resident hunting licenses, together with district licenses (see below) generally consume about 90% of the total animal quota. Resident hunting licenses are still heavily subsidised, mostly with values below the selling price of the associated meat on the local market, and are subject to considerable misuse, as well as being difficult to monitor effectively.

District Hunting: District Hunting Licenses are sold by district councils and may be accessed by people living in a district. District license fees are more heavily subsidised than National Licenses and are even more subject to misuse.

Special Hunting Licenses: Special hunting licenses, or “Special Licenses” as they are commonly called, have been the subject of sustained concern for over twenty years. In an historical perspective, concerns raised have covered a broad area, including the absence of formal quotas and alleged misuse by safari outfitters, traditional leaders and politicians, lack of transparency, and alleged misuse by the wildlife management organisation itself. Nevertheless, the license category persists, as do the concerns about the transparency and reporting surrounding its use, although there are now five established quotas (for the Minister, research, game capture, traditional ceremonies and problem animals).

Namibia

Namibia embraces the full range of wildlife use options on its State, communal and commercial land that includes non-consumptive tourism (wildlife viewing), consumptive tourism (recreational hunting and fishing) and, consumptive use for meat skins and other products.

Recreational “*Biltong*” Hunting is mainly meat motivated and undertaken by residents and neighbouring South Africans and landowners own hunting for game meat production and use. The declared *biltong* hunting season is usually through May to end August (four months) for commercial farms with registered game-proof fences, and June to July (two months) for farms with non-registered fences. Recreational hunting involves only four of the most populous species (Kudu, Gemsbok, Springbok and Warthog). One permit per hunter is issued per hunting season and allows the holder to hunt three “small” game (i.e. Springbok and Warthog) and two “large game” (i.e. Kudu and Gemsbok) during the season.

Sport Hunting: Management and Administration

The sport hunting industry is by far the most lucrative form of hunting in Southern Africa and one that receives the most attention from the wildlife management authorities. The approaches adopted by the various countries vary considerably depending on the policy and legislative environment, as well as the magnitude of the hunting industry.

Tanzania

Numerous hunting concessions are distributed throughout Tanzania either in Game Reserves, Game Controlled Areas or Open Areas. The Wildlife Division leases the concessions on five-year tenure to hunting outfitters that fulfil the requirements defined in a set of hunting regulations, and who have been authorised to guide foreign clients on big game hunting safaris. An Advisory Committee on Block Allocation appointed by the Minister of Natural Resources and Tourism screens applications by hunting outfitters and advises the Minister on the allocation of concessions. Concessions are therefore not allocated according to any transparent market-driven system (e.g. auction, tender etc).

Each concession is allocated a quota of animals that can be hunted during the season (July to December). Outfitters must utilise the quota to generate revenue of not less than 40% of the value of the total quota allocated. If the outfitter fails to do so, he is required to make a top-up payment to the Wildlife Division to meet the 40% minimum. The outfitter is further required to contribute to anti-poaching, road construction and community development, although the criteria for these requirements are rather vague. A professional hunter licensed by the Wildlife Division must guide clients on the hunt.

The Wildlife Division has developed a standard agreement that is issued to safari outfitters who have secured hunting blocks. This agreement outlines the responsibilities of the Government and the outfitter. The responsibilities of the government include:

Issuing the necessary permits
Allocating hunting blocks
Prescribe the fees to be paid, including any changes to the fees
Supervision of all hunting expeditions and safaris (game scouts accompany all hunting parties)
Monitor all fees to be paid by the outfitter
Control the transfer of licenses
Withdraw hunting permits in instances where the Wildlife Conservation Act is contravened
Ensure that the outfitter contributes to community development projects in the district within which the hunting block is situated
Withhold issuing any hunting permits to an outfitter and/or Professional Hunter who has failed to adhere to the ethics and standards required by the hunting industry in Tanzania

The responsibilities of the outfitter are to:

Produce evidence that he has acquired all the necessary permits and licenses
That he has the necessary financial resources, and that the company is registered in Tanzania.
Provide names and particulars of the professional hunters
Obtain all hunting permits from the government
Hire the services of a professional hunter to conduct and supervise all hunting safaris
Only conduct hunting safaris in blocks that are allocated to the outfitter
Only hunts the species specified on the permits
Only employs Tanzanian nationals for manual and casual labour
Abide by all directives, regulations and by-laws relating to the Act, Revenue Laws, Exchange Control Laws, Immigration Laws
Pay all prescribed fees (set at US\$7 500/block/year)
Undertake to utilise not less than 40% of the total quota of key species allocated as well as to generate revenue of not less than 40% of the value of the total quota so allocated
Undertake anti-poaching operations during and after the hunting seasons
Ensure that all hunting trophies are exported within 60 days after the completion of the safari
Be conversant with the Wildlife Conservation Act, 1974
Pay for all animals killed and/or wounded before trophies are exported
Not resort to court action before complying with the provisions of the Act to resolve his

remedies against government

Pay for the hunting block(s) before the hunting season starts

Contribute to the development and welfare of the Community in the District

Other miscellaneous requirements include:

Professional hunters are in overall charge during a safari

Any accidents that occur during a hunting safari are to be reported to government

Outfitter is to replace a Professional Hunter in the event that he is injured or becomes unavailable during a safari

Carcasses that are not utilised by the outfitter may be appropriated by government at no charge

All arms and ammunition not utilised by the client are to be exported unless the client surrenders these to the government

All professional hunters are required to pay the prescribed fees

Contravention's of the agreement can lead to termination by the government

Outfitter to ensure that all employees adhere to the terms and conditions of the agreement

The table below lists the fees that are payable by the hunter and outfitter respectively to the Tanzanian authorities. When combined these fees add up to approximately US\$3,000 for a 21-day safari (excluding guest fee, animal licence fees, firearm import permit (US\$120/gun)).

Fees payable by tourist hunters and outfitters in Tanzania

Item	<u>Fees paid by the hunting tourist</u>	Cost
Permit fees	For a hunting safari up to seven days	US\$450
	For a hunting safari more than seven days	US\$600
Conservation fees	Daily fee per tourist hunter	US\$100
Observer fees	Daily fee per person accompanying a tourist hunter	US\$50
Trophy handling fees	For a hunting safari up to seven days	US\$200
	For a hunting safari more than seven days	US\$300
Animal licence fees	For each animal shot or wounded. The amounts vary according to the schedule	-
<u>Fees paid by the outfitter</u>		
Block fees	Annual fee per concession payable by the outfitter	US\$7,500
Professional hunters license (annual)	Professional hunters resident in Tanzania	US\$1,000
	Professional hunters non-resident in Tanzania	US\$2,000

Conditions of a permit: A gazetted schedule of trophy fees sets the price in US dollars for

every type of animal that may be hunted on a foreign hunting license. A minimum safari length and rifle calibre is specified depending on the species to be hunted. Based on these criteria a hunting permit is issued authorising the client to hunt a selection of animals. After completing his/her safari, the client must return the hunting permit indicating which animals have been killed and/or wounded. The game scout that accompanied the safari verifies the Hunting Permit as being correct and an invoice is raised by the Wildlife Division billing the client for the animals hunted. On receipt of the trophy fees payment and a trophy-handling fee, an export license is issued allowing the client to take his/her trophies home.

Zimbabwe

The strength of the Zimbabwe sport hunting industry is found in its diversification. Various types of hunting take place depending on the different land types, and various methods are used to allocate hunting rights which in turn are priced differentially. The different methods have evolved to meet the particular situations and each have a range of merits and demerits. In essence, two types of hunting occur in Zimbabwe:

Recreational hunting conducted by Zimbabwean citizens either on private or State land (see Section 4.1.2).

Commercial sport hunting by international clients under the direction of a registered Zimbabwean safari outfitter/professional hunter.

Hunting takes place on three categories of land: private (now restricted to a few conservancies and game ranches); communal land (conducted by commercial companies through a “joint venture” agreement with RDCs) and State land (Safari Area concessions allocated on tender through PWMA or on Forestry Land).

Private Land: Notwithstanding the upheaval caused by the land reform programme, allocation and pricing of hunting on private land uses one of three methods:

Allocation by private treaty between the landowner and the hunter, at a price agreed between the two.

Allocation by tender, either on an individual hunt basis, or for all hunting on that particular piece of land.

Allocation by auction (rarely), once again either on a hunt-by-hunt basis or for all the hunting in that area.

Communal Land: Exploitation of the significant wildlife populations that occur in the various Communal Lands in Zimbabwe is facilitated through the CAMPFIRE programme, and methods of allocation and pricing vary. The most common practice employed is for the hunting concession to be put out to tender. The various RDCs with Appropriate Authority received considerable support and training provided by the donor and NGO community to assist them in preparing and evaluating tenders (WWF, 1997). Two pricing methods apply in the tender situation:

The prospective operator offers a fixed amount for the right to hunt in the area and for the animals on quota.

The prospective operator offers the lessor (i.e. the RDC) a percentage of the gross turnover achieved on the concession (usually about 25 – 40%). This is usually subject to a guaranteed minimum amount that the tenderer will pay to the lessor. The payment schedules are supported by an audit certificate prepared by professional accountants.

In most cases the resulting lease agreement is quoted in US dollars but paid in local currency.

Forestry Land and Agricultural Development Authority Land: The Forestry Commission in Zimbabwe is responsible for large tracts of land, some of which is adjacent to National Parks. Consequently the Forestry Commission is able to exploit this through its own safari hunting company. This is a unique situation however, and one that is not without controversy because the Commission does not pay trophy or concession fees. Consequently the Commission is able to offer big game hunting at a lower price than their counterparts in the private sector that secure concessions either through the Parks and Wildlife Authority or through the CAMPFIRE programme.

The Agricultural Development Authority is a parastatal that owns significant tracts of land, some of which supports wildlife. It is also therefore in a position to offer commercial and recreation hunting to the private sector.

Parks and Wildlife Estate: The Parks and Wildlife Authority offer at least 18 sport hunting concessions on 3 – 5-year leases in the Safari Areas. Initially the concessions were sold by open auction with the highest bidder securing the area. The pricing of these concessions was relatively complicated. The price bid at the auction was effectively an up-front concession fee. It secured for the operator the right to hunt in the given concession for the duration of the lease, and the amount bid was paid in advance. In the first year of operations, the operator paid the government trophy fees for animals on a *fixed quota* as well as any animals shot on an *optional quota*. In subsequent years of the concession, in addition to the government trophy fees on the fixed and optional quota, the operator paid an additional “concession fee” amounting to 20% of the overall value of the fixed quota.

In recent years the Parks Authority has abandoned the open auction system in favour of a closed tender. Potential white and non-Zimbabwean bidders are required to identify a black Zimbabwean partner(s) and register their company in Zimbabwe in order to qualify for the tender.

Permit Requirements: All foreign hunters visiting Zimbabwe are required to complete a TR2 form prior to the hunt taking place and have this approved by the Parks Authority. This form is numbered serially and allocated to registered safari outfitters. It contains information on the name of the company, the area/concession to be hunted, dates of the hunt, daily rates charged for big game and plains game hunting (including the professional hunter daily fee) and non-hunting guest rate.

On completion of the hunt, the outfitter is required to declare which animals were killed/wounded, the quota balance, area in which the animals were hunted (including grid references for all animals killed), trophy measurements and the trophy fee.

The client must pay for the hunt within 14 days and the foreign exchange banked immediately. The deposit slips and the TR2 form are then to be presented to the bankers who are required to register the TR2 form with the Reserve Bank in order for the clients’ trophies to be exported.

The documents required to ship trophies include: acquitted TR2 form, hunting invoice, export application, veterinary certificate, packing list and shipping instructions.

Botswana

The main management objective of Botswana’s sport hunting industry is to safeguard the overall integrity of the industry whilst maximising the revenue generated from a sustainable resource. It has developed management structures that strive to ensure that standards are maintained, and monitoring and administration systems put in place that allow for informed

management decisions when establishing the quotas and fees of animals to be hunted.

The DWNP, under the Ministry of Environment and Tourism is the primary government agency responsible for wildlife and sport hunting management. Although wildlife policy and legislation has promoted the utilisation of wildlife through game ranching/farming in free-hold land and CBNRM programmes in communal lands, DWNP still maintains ultimate decision making in all matters related to consumptive use of wildlife resources. The ultimate responsibility and accountability to manage wildlife through, for example, the setting of quotas, still remains firmly in the hands of the DWNP. The monitoring and administration of all forms of hunting in Botswana is therefore centrally controlled through the DWNP. However, due to a lack of true devolution of management rights over the hunting resource, incentives for key stakeholders such as safari operators, communities and ranch owners to provide data to DWNP for monitoring and administration is often lacking.

DWNP maintains a database for the national RAO quotas and off-take rates, however because of non-compliance with returning hunting forms mainly from citizens, (i.e. Single Game Licenses, Small Game License, Special Game License and Land Holders Privilege Permits) it is not possible to determine how many animals are hunted.

The requirement for submitting hunting return forms within 30 days of hunting to DWNP is formalised in legislation, and hunt return forms are included with every license issued. By law, each hunter in Botswana is issued with a hunting card that is used to record all particulars of hunting. Such a card is expected to be produced for inspection during hunting trips and when obtaining new licenses. Failure to do so could result in a fine or six months imprisonment. In addition, DWNP are required by law to refuse new licenses to those who have not submitted returns. In general, foreign sports hunters abide closely to these rules, as trophies cannot be exported unless hunt return forms have been submitted. In contrast, citizen hunters abide less by these rules, and the lack of a centrally collated hunt return database means that DWNP are unable to monitor the situation.

Consequently, DWNP are hampered by a lack of critical information such as how many animals have been hunted when making management decisions, especially with regard to quota setting. The result is that very conservative quotas of animals are set for the sport hunting industry, reducing the effective role hunting can play in providing incentive to sustainably manage and conserve the wildlife resource. The DWNP also severely restricts the range of species on quota for citizens. For example, sable, sitatunga, buffalo, crocodile, eland, and lechwe are generally not available on quota in citizen hunting areas. These species are however included on quota in commercial concession areas, and some community management areas where the majority of the hunting is by foreign clients.

Allocation of Hunting Concessions: Several community-based conservation programmes have been successfully initiated in the WMAs located Ngamiland in north-western Botswana in recent years. Communities wanting to enter into a joint venture agreement are required to establish a registered Trust whose objective will be to sustainably manage the natural resources of the WMA for the benefit and development of the community. The Trust and the Land Board enter into a “Head Agreement” in which the Trust is granted sole rights of managing the resources within the WMA. Through the “Head Agreement”, the Trust is empowered to set the terms and conditions under which companies submit their tenders for the concession. These include:

The purpose of the tender (enter into a joint venture, managing hunting and tourism, guidelines to preparing technical and financial proposals etc.).
Rights of the Trust and safari company (restricted to Botswana registered companies, structure of the joint venture, duration of lease, condition for renewal, exclusivity rights etc.).

Conditions imposed by the Trust (provision of Community Escort Guides, delivery of meat, community traditional rights to collect firewood, thatching grass etc., hunting season, citizen hunting, hiring of local labour etc.).

To qualify for the tender, only companies registered in Botswana can apply. In addition, safari operators are forbidden from canvassing for votes in the WMA between the time that the tender is advertised and the award of the tender. Canvassing in any form is prohibited and can lead to disqualification.

The tender procedure requires that three documents be submitted under a separate cover. These are:

The Technical Proposal: This is to be submitted in accordance with detailed terms and conditions prepared by the Trust. These are:

The technical proposal must not contain any reference to the tenderer, its directors, shareholders or its employees, or any reference to the financial offer. Failure to meet this requirement will result in disqualification.

The technical proposal should be within the framework of relevant government legislation and any land use or development plans for the WMA.

Clear and concise statements regarding the social, ecological, economic and management objectives of the joint venture are to be provided, including the proposed joint venture arrangement.

A brief outline of the natural and economic environment is to be provided (i.e. national, regional and local setting of the project, current business and economic environment, understanding of government policies, understanding of social and development needs of the community, understanding of district development plans, understanding of natural and socio-economic environment within the WMA).

The proposal must demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the current wildlife status of the area, including the intentions of the tenderer towards managing the wildlife populations and how the wildlife populations will be protected from illegal use.

The technical proposal must clearly show the activities proposed to be undertaken within the WMA (hunting, photographic, walking, canoeing etc.).

The technical proposal must demonstrate how the harvesting of natural resources by the local community will be accommodated under the project, including how community/resident hunting will be managed to avoid conflicting with the commercial activities.

All proposed development of infrastructure in the WMA must be described and detailed on appropriate maps, including detailed costed plans and work programmes. These plans must also demonstrate that they will not adversely affect the area, its people or wildlife populations.

A detailed development plan is to be included that takes into account climate, breeding seasons, any animal migrations etc.

The tenders should stipulate the number of local employment opportunities that the company will provide and the respective positions, competitive salaries, guaranteed minimum of community members employed, season contract work, staff training, type of accommodation etc.

Tenders are required to provide clear indications of their proposed community development programme (e.g. skills transfer, staff recruitment, development of handicrafts, development of small scale businesses, assistance with transport, provision of water, provision of food, cultural tourism, educational development, schools, clinics etc.).

A cash flow analysis of the proposed infrastructure development and sources of finance are to be included. Projected income should be clearly explained with anticipated tourist numbers and turnover.

Tenderers are required to demonstrate how they will market the area.

The Financial Proposal: This is a relatively simple document that highlights the following:

A guaranteed minimum land rental with proposed increments during the course of the agreement.

A resource royalty as a proposed percentage of the gross income accruing from the use of the natural resources (usually set at about 4%).

A fee for each species on the quota equal to or above the reserve price. Tenderers should show their proposed increments.

The Company Background: The tenderer is required to provide the following minimum information in this document:

Copy of the company's Certificate of Incorporation, including a list of all major shareholders, the directors and their nationality.

Copy of any tourism licenses.

An overview of the companies activities in hunting and/or photographic tourism in Botswana.

Names and CVs of their professional guides and hunters the company intends to employ.

Any brochures/advertising material that the company may want to include.

Tender Assessment Process: A technical committee is appointed by the Trust to review the Technical Proposals. This committee consists of members of the Trust, Land Board, DWNP and a community representative. Each technical proposal is scored in terms of its technical aspects, merits and compliance with the tender conditions. A short-list of tenders (usually not more than six) is then prepared and presented to the Review Committee of the Trust.

The Review Committee then opens the envelopes containing the Financial Proposal and Company Background. With the help of the Technical Committee, a short-list of the three best tender proposals is selected. These are then presented to the Village Council. In certain circumstances, the short listed tenderers may be required to present themselves for an interview and present a synopsis of their company to the meeting.

Thereafter a secret ballot is conducted to select the successful candidate. In the event that the financial offer of the winning proposal is lower than any of the other bids, then successful company may be asked to match the highest financial bid.

Zambia

Zambia has 19 national parks (NPs) and (currently) 36 Game Management Areas (GMAs). Collectively, they cover 23 million hectares or about 30 per cent of the country (eight per cent and 22 per cent respectively). GMAs are generally contiguous with the parks, and are designed to serve as buffer areas between the parks and settled land. Sustainable consumptive utilization of wildlife is permitted in the GMAs, mainly through commercial safari hunting. Under Zambia's new wildlife policy, local communities are responsible for the management of GMAs, regulated and supervised by ZAWA. The main economic benefit arising from wildlife management of the GMAs is revenue from fees for commercial safari hunting.

Non Resident Hunting or Sport Hunting: Non Resident Hunting commences on 1st May to 31st December of each hunting season. A Non Resident Hunting Licence is issued to registered Hunting Outfitter's holding a Safari Hunting Concession Agreement with ZAWA. In addition the Hunting Outfitter is required to provide ZAWA with the names of all

Professional Hunters they intend to employ for each hunting season.

A Non-Resident Hunting Licence is only issued to a client that intends to hunt with a Zambian Registered Safari Company, and has paid the prescribed fees. Non Resident Order Form is used to identify what animals are to be hunted by the Client. This form indicates the name of the Client, type of hunt, duration of hunt and the GMA where the hunting will be conducted. The client is required to keep an original copy of the Non Resident Hunting Licence at all times and maintain a record of all animals shot. This licence is to be signed by the field monitoring staff (ZAWA Wildlife Police Officers or Village Game Scouts) as well as the Professional Hunter. On completion of the hunt, all trophies to be exported are required to be inspected by a ZAWA Licensing Officer. Only after this inspection is completed is an Export Permit issued.

The Safari Hunting Outfitter is required to submit annual reports to ZAWA indicating quota utilisation, moneys received in respect of animal fees, amount paid for various licences and concession fees paid.

Namibia

The management and administrative systems of Namibia are probably more applicable to the situation in South Africa than any of the other countries. Namibia maintains one of the most well-regulated and managed sport hunting industries in the region. Management is focused on attaining maximum economic and social benefits from a finite hunting resource in all of the countries land tenure systems. This has been achieved through the establishment of private, non-governmental and governmental management structures that have ensured that standards are maintained and monitoring and administration systems put in place so that informed management decisions can be made when, for example, quotas and fees of animals to be hunted are established and/or revised.

Implementation of management and administrative systems in Namibia has had to take into account the unique physical environment that exists in that country. In particular, the systems have had to cater for an extensive private land sector, and communally owned land. Its wildlife resource are predominantly desert dwelling and migratory species. To exploit these resources, policies and guidelines have been developed that encourage the establishment game ranching on private land. In addition conservancies have been established for the purpose of resource conservation by multiple landholders on both private and communal land. The benefits from such conservancies are then shared between the members in terms of a formal constitution.

Allocation of Community Conservancy Concessions: Sport hunting is the primary form of wildlife use and is undertaken through a “joint venture” agreement with the private sector. With the help of the NGO community, a participatory system has been developed to assist the Communal Conservancy Committee to prepare, evaluate and award a “joint venture” tender. This involves a number of steps that are explained in the “*Procedural Guidelines for awarding Trophy Hunting Concession*”. The steps involved are abbreviated below.

The tender procedure is also carefully structured so that the local community is provided with all the necessary information. An abbreviated example of a Tender Form is provided below:

Table One. Total Guaranteed Value For Trophy Animals, Non-Trophy Animals, and Offered Price For Problem Animals, Bushpig, Roan and Sable Antelope During The 2005 – 2007 Hunting

Seasons:

Species	Number on Quota per Annum	US Dollar Price per Individual Animal	US Dollar Amount Tendered for Animals per Annum (column 2 x column 3)	Number of Years Species Quota on Offer	Total US Dollars Guaranteed for Tendered For Trophy & Non-Trophy Animals (column 4 x column 5) For The 2005-2007 Concession Period	US Dollar Amount Tendered per Problem Animals and (column 3) <u>Payment by Animal Taken</u>
---------	---------------------------	---------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Elephant 6 trophy bulls 33 non-trophy for traditional feast 3 problem bull (trophy) 3 problem bull (non-trophy) 3 problem cow

3 Buffalo 10 trophy 3 Kudu 4 trophy 3 Warthog 4 trophy 3 Impala 4 trophy 3 Bushpigs 10 trophies 3 Roan 1 trophy 2 Sable 1 trophy 1 Hyena 4 trophies 3 Side-striped jackal 5 trophies 3 Duiker 10 trophies 3 Baboon 10 trophies 3 Lion 2 trophy male 3 Lion 2 trophy female 3 Leopard 2 trophy 3 Hippo 4 trophy bulls 3

3 non-trophy for traditional feasts				3		
-------------------------------------	--	--	--	---	--	--

3 non-trophy problem animals 3 Crocodile

4 trophies				3		
------------	--	--	--	---	--	--

TOTAL US DOLLAR AMOUNT GUARANTEED



The successful bidder of the tender process is invited to sign a formal Memorandum of Understanding that provides the conditions and responsibilities of the two parties, notably the terms of the hunting agreement, duration, payment conditions, quota, definition of hunting areas and the operating conditions amongst others.

An important document however is the *Operational Conditions and Guidelines for the Hunting Concession*. This manual provides a description of what is expected from both parties in the day-to-day operations of the hunting concession, and includes information on:

- Concession Area
- Concession Period
- Payment of Fees (Guaranteed and Non-Guaranteed Income)
- Transfer of Concession/Animals on Quota
- Hunting Camp
- Hunting Zones
- Problem Animals
- Game for Traditional Authorities and Festivals:
- Meat Distribution
- Employment and Training
- Communication
- Reporting
- Cooperation and Community Relation
- Suspension/Reinstatement of Operations
- Government Laws and Regulations
- Indemnity
- Amendment of Contract

Quota Setting Methods for Sport Hunting

There is no perfect system in place in the region that can be used as the “best practice” for setting quotas for sport hunting. The reason for this is that the biological information is either not available or is subject to error. The general opinion however is that quotas should be set on a rigorous objective basis, regardless of the weakness of the available information. A rigorous approach will focus the discussions on the technical issues and make clear statements about the information used and the calculations made to derive the quotas. Ultimately, the process should strive to achieve consistency in quota allocations, especially as the scientific data becomes more reliable.

Zimbabwe

The PWMA sets quotas each year for the number of animals per species that can be hunted in each Safari Area concession, and approves CAMPFIRE quotas from RDCs in communal areas and private landowners from the commercial sector. The process involves a consultation process between the Park Authority and the respective safari operators. Aerial and ground survey data are used (where available) together with the ground reconnaissance by PWMA staff and more indirect methods such as safari operators perception of animal abundance and trophy quality size. Quotas should be approved by end of October for the following year, allowing safari operators to market their hunts during the off-season period between December and March at the hunting conventions in the USA and Europe.

Aerial censuses are conducted during the dry season and largely focus on elephants although

some other large mammals such as buffalo, sable, waterbuck and zebra are sometimes counted. No attempt is made to count the light coloured species (impala, kudu) or any of the small mammals (duiker, warthog).

Quotas for elephant are set at up to 0.5% of the population estimate while quotas for other large mammals such as buffalo, sable, waterbuck, and zebra are set at approximately 2% - 5% of population estimates. The quotas for large cats are set at up to 8% of populations estimates.

Communal Land Hunting Quotas: The RDCs that have been awarded Appropriate Authority status have been responsible for setting quotas for communal land hunting concessions since the 1990's. Assistance was provided by WWF – SARPO who ran quota-setting workshops which used information from the previous quota, poaching data, information from safari operators, community information, trophy quality trends, aerial survey and transect survey results. The availability of data and accurateness of quota setting differs from one district to another depending on the availability of data.

In the absence of regular aerial and ground surveys, an adaptive management approach is now used to determine quotas. This method integrates data from direct and indirect monitoring systems that are then crosschecked in a participatory process with all stakeholders. A matrix for each species is developed in which all available data is graphically represented. The matrix begins with the current quota and then considers whether the available data justifies an increase, decrease or no change.

Private Land Hunting Quotas: Up until 1998, PWMA were not involved in quota setting in private lands. Landowners were given total discretion on quota setting. The logic being that that it was in their best economic interest to sustainably harvest their wildlife populations. Although this approach seemed to work as shown by the rapid expansion of wildlife populations and habitat observed in the commercial sector between 1975 and 1998, including a thriving live game capture industry, a lack of monitoring and knowledge on the size and dynamics of the industry led PWMA to instigate the need for annual quotas and returns to be submitted and approved through *Statutory Instrument 26 of 1998*. Very few of the landowners are in a position to conduct scientifically based surveys with the result that quota setting is based on educated guesses as neither party have grounds to contest whether quotas should be increased or decreased. There are instances though where regular scientific surveys are conducted that provide long term trends in the status of the populations (Booth, 2004, de la Harpe, 2004)

Botswana

Each year the DWNP issues RAO quotas for all forms of consumptive wildlife utilization in the country. DWNP calculates quota estimates using biological off-take rates that relate to reproductive ability and are based on national aerial surveys that are conducted each year. As such, national population estimates and allocated quotas are accurate for those large species that can be accurately spotted and surveyed from the air (elephant, sable, tsessebe), but the remaining predominantly smaller species such as kudu, duiker and lion cannot be accurately surveyed from the air, and consequently the RAO quota for these species are set using a more conservative “rule of thumb” approach. Quota setting in CHAs in State land and community-managed areas are developed and issued solely by DWNP. However, politics plays a significant role in quota allocation, as the moratorium on lion hunting in 2001 demonstrated.

Although stakeholders are allowed to comment on the quota, little participation from operator and key community stakeholders on the ground occurs in setting the quota. The

same holds true in free-hold and lease-hold land ranches, where land holders are required to submit wildlife population estimates and their off-take quotas are then assessed and approved by DWNP, which sometimes involves ranch visits.

DWNP are, however, aware of the shortfalls in the quota setting methodology that relies solely on aerial surveys for the smaller huntable species. As such, the Department has begun to support the notion of using trophy quality monitoring data from Botswana Wildlife Management Association (BWMA) programme as an additional data set for indicating population status.

Animals hunted through the issuance of Single Game Licenses, Community Managed Hunting Quotas, and private sport hunting safari concessions are provided for under the RAO quota. Conversely, animals hunted under the Small Game License, Bird License, and Land Holders

Privilege Permits do not fall under the RAO quota. These licenses and permits provide for an additional quota of animals that is set outside the RAO quota, which tends to inflate the overall quota.

Tanzania

Monitoring efforts of wildlife populations in Tanzania tend to concentrate in and around protected areas managed by the Tanzania National Parks Authority (TANAPA). Most areas managed by the Wildlife Division, which include most of the country's hunting blocks, are not subject to any form of population monitoring, with the exception of the Selous Game Reserve (Blanc, et. al. 2003).

The approach used by the Wildlife Division to allocate quotas is to rely on the knowledge of Project Managers (= Wardens) and Regional Game Wardens who suggest quotas for the Game Reserves and Game Controlled and Open Areas respectively. Aerial survey data are taken into account (where available) together with past records of quota utilisation and recommendations of professional hunters and outfitters. Nonetheless, it is openly admitted that quota setting is very much based on an educated guess (Severre, 1995).

At the end of each season the quotas are reviewed to accommodate specific requests from officers in the field and from professional hunters. However, there are two important key factors regarding the setting of quotas that impact significantly on the Tanzanian sport hunting industry. First, the 40% utilisation criteria used as the basis to determine whether an outfitter is booking sufficient clients. Utilisation below 40% could result in the block been withdrawn from the outfitter. Secondly, the Wildlife Division relies on quota utilisation to generate the bulk of its income. As a result there is a tendency to increase the quotas in order to increase the income to the Division irrespective of the population status. There has also been a tendency for the Wildlife Division to split a hunting block in half (or even four) and allocate the same quota to each of the new blocks effectively doubling (even quadrupling) the original quota. This practice is especially detrimental to the large carnivore populations, many of which are now suspected of being hunted in an unsustainable manner.

In its defence, the WD recognises the shortfalls in its present system, notably:

The cost of conducting aerial and/or ground surveys regularly on a countrywide basis.

Aerial surveys are unable to provide data for key species such as lion and leopard.

Meagre resources are allocated for conservation monitoring.

No organised system of monitoring trophy quality and other criteria has been put in place (although there are limited data available from the Selous Game Reserve).

Zambia

Three main types of hunting safaris are offered in Zambia that determines the quotas for the various hunting blocks:

Classical (or Delux) Safaris: This safari is offered for a minimum period of 14 days and the bag consists of one lion and/or leopard, and an assortment of plains game, including buffalo. Mini Safari: This is a 7-day safari and is made up of 5 plains game species excluding roan, sable and specialised species such as black lechwe, Kafue lechwe, sitatunga and tsessebe.

Currently the policy requires that prime hunting areas have to conduct five classic safaris and seven mini-hunts, regardless of the hunting blocks real ability to support these quotas. Similar, but slightly reduced requirements apply to secondary hunting areas.

The area concession fee is paid per hunt. Presently, outfitters sell a combined lion and leopard classic safari wherever possible and therefore are driven to try and obtain sufficient lion and leopard quotas to do this.

Community Involvement in the Hunting Industry

Reference has been made in various sections of this paper to community-based natural resource programmes, and the involvement of communities in “joint venture” agreements with sport hunting outfitters. There is also a large amount of literature available that discusses the pros and cons of CBNRM. In this section an overview is provided of the general approach adopted to involve communities in the hunting industry through “joint venture” arrangements to exploit wildlife on their land.

Definition of a “Joint Venture” Contract

It is important at the very outset to clarify what is meant by “joint venture” – a term that is freely used to describe the type of contractual arrangements that is envisaged between a community and an entrepreneur. Generally it is envisaged that a community and an entrepreneur will enter into some form of agreement (or contract) to exploit the wildlife resource that occurs on community-owned land. This is usually in the form of a “*joint venture*” which is interpreted to mean: *A community and other parties form a separate organisation to undertake protection, management and/or utilisation of resources in CHA/WMA/Buffer zone etc. depending on the land tenure status.*

The joint venture agreement confers *Security of Tenure* which means *the authorised period, which an area designated as a CHA/WMA/Buffer Zone shall remain as such.* It also confers *User Rights* which means that the community has *the lawful permission to use wildlife resources found within the CHA/WMA/Buffer zone according to the existing laws and regulations.*

Depending on the policies and regulations governing access to wildlife, the Wildlife Authority usually grants the *User Rights* to an appropriate authority (AA) at the community level that has been appointed and given the mandate to manage the CHA/WMA/Buffer Zone. Once user rights have been granted, the AA can enter into contracts with investors for the purpose of utilising the wildlife resources.

Legal Interpretation of a “Joint Venture”

Usually a contract is the foundation of the relationship between two consenting parties (in this case between the entrepreneur and the community). However it is important that the legal meaning of the term “joint venture” is thoroughly understood by all parties since it has

far reaching implications in the manner in which agreements are concluded.

Traditionally a “joint venture” will involve two (or more) parties who bring together their respective skills, assets and financial resources to develop and take advantage of an economic opportunity (in this case it could be a hunting concession or a photographic safari lodge). In doing so, both parties to the agreement will provide the technical, financial and managerial skills necessary for the success of the “joint venture”. Equally, both parties will be responsible for their actions and will be required to share all the risks associated with the venture. More importantly they will be required to equally share the financial risks involved depending on their equity in the venture i.e. all parties will be liable for any financial losses, law suits and tax implications associated with the venture.

The critical issue here is that local communities (or the AA) are not likely to be in a position to inject any substantial financial resources to the “joint venture” nor will they be willing to be exposed to the financial risks associated with a hunting or tourism venture. That is not to say that their contribution in the form of access to the land and the wildlife resource is not without value. Rather, the vulnerability and circumstances surrounding community participation in wildlife-based “joint ventures” dictates that local communities should be protected from the financial risk associated with such ventures. Given that the access to the resource is “communally owned”, an institution such as the AA cannot compromise this position in a way that they lose control of their access rights to the resource to a third party through a financial impropriety.

At the same time, given the level of investment and the nature of wildlife-based commercial activities, it is essential that the interests of both parties be protected through a legally binding agreement. In particular the structure of the agreement should ensure that the communities receive a fair return for the assets under their control – in this case access to the wildlife resource – and the interests of the entrepreneur are secured.

It is therefore critically important when developing “joint venture” initiatives that both parties understand that it is usually the entrepreneur who will assume all financial risk and will be responsible for providing the technical and managerial skills necessary for the success of the venture. It is for this reason that the entrepreneur will seek security of tenure to ensure that he/she can recover their investment, and insist that the local community uphold certain obligations and responsibilities in order to protect his/her investment.

Legally and technically therefore such agreements should be referred to as **Resource Management Contracts**. However, for simplicity sake, it is easier to describe the type of arrangement as “joint ventures”.

Type and Duration of Contracts

The two most important parts of the contract is its financial structure and the duration. How these are agreed upon will determine the complexity of the agreement and how the contract will be marketed.

The Payment System: There are many ways in which a community can charge a safari outfitter for the use of an area and for access to the animals on the land. Four popular ways are:

A single fee for the use of the area (applicable for either short duration safari hunting and/or photographic safari ventures)

A fee for each animal shot/wounded/captured

A percentage of the gross income of the operation (applicable to either hunting or

photographic operations of medium duration ventures)

A negotiated “joint venture” in which the entrepreneur agrees to certain direct and indirect costs, including certain social and environmental obligations (applicable to either long-term hunting or photographic operations).

The pros and cons of these various methods are discussed below.

Single fee lease paid annually: In such agreements, the community and the entrepreneur agree on a lump sum figure that is paid annually for the right to use an area for photographic tourism or to hunt a quota of animals. The community is not exposed to any complicated legal arrangements and the financial risks to both parties are minimal.

The disadvantage of this system is that there is the possibility that the community will not receive the full value for their assets. Furthermore, the entrepreneur is not bound through any legal arrangement to meet certain obligations (employment, provision of social services etc.) since security of tenure is not assured. It is also difficult to demonstrate the linkage between the value of wild animals and the tourism activities – communities therefore cannot see the long-term future of such ventures and tend not to have the incentives to conserve wildlife in their areas.

Fee paid for each animal shot: In this type of contract, the community agrees that the safari hunting company will pay a set fee for each animal shot (or wounded). It may also set certain conditions regarding the hunting season, delivery of meat and where animals may be hunted. The duration for this type of agreement varies from three to five years with the option to cancel the agreement at short notice.

The advantage of this approach is that the agreement is easy to administer and it is possible to demonstrate the linkages between the value of wildlife and conservation. The strong incentive for communities to conserve their wildlife is easily demonstrated because they are paid directly for the animals that they produce.

The disadvantage of this system is that the hunting company is not afforded any level of security and thus will be reluctant to invest or develop the hunting area (e.g. provide water supplies, conduct anti-poaching activities, monitor game populations etc.) There is also the risk that the operator may not shoot all the animals on the quota and thus the community may not receive the maximum income. Another disadvantage is that it is not always possible to determine the market value of the individual animals. As a result, there is the risk that the community could “undersell” the animals and thus be disadvantaged, particularly if the agreement is for an extended period of time.

Percentage of gross income of the operation: This type of agreement assumes that the community has an understanding of the business environment in which the entrepreneur operates. Furthermore the agreement is based on *gross income* rather than *net income* so that the community is protected from the affects of the entrepreneur’s ability to control costs. Depending on the structure of the agreement, it also provides the community with the opportunity to become more directly involved with the management and operation of the business through the transfer of skills. It is, however, important to define how gross revenue will be calculated and how it will be monitored. This presupposes a thorough understanding of the hunting business.

The advantage of this form of contract is that the community will benefit when the tour operator has a good year, however, the disadvantage is that in a poor year both parties will suffer. It is possible to protect against this by building a guaranteed minimum income into the agreement so that communities will at least receive some income in bad years. Another disadvantage is that it is difficult to monitor such agreements since it requires accurate and

Forest development on the part of the outfitter. In most cases outfitters are not willing to share information regarding their financial arrangements with third parties, especially in situations where they are assuming all the risk.

Applicable to hunting

Negotiated “Joint Venture”: These are individually negotiated partnerships that describe in detail the responsibilities of both parties to take advantage of the hunting opportunities within the limits set by the community. The duration of this type of agreement can vary from three years to 25 years, and may include a renewal clause of some form. The advantage of this type of agreement is that it provides security of tenure, and the financial rewards for both parties can be high. There is also the incentive for the outfitter to invest in the long-term future of the hunting area which in turn improves the management of wildlife. Similarly there are opportunities for the community to become involved in the direct management of the hunting area e.g. training of professional hunters, employment of community game scouts etc.

In essence the agreement incorporates five key sections:

- The purpose of the agreement.
- The responsibilities of both parties.
- The financial arrangements, including the payment schedule.
- Conditions under which the agreement may be terminated, including clear remedies to correct any breach of the agreement by the operator.
- General terms and conditions that protect the interests of both parties and the biophysical features of the hunting area.

The “spirit” of such agreements ensures that the “land holder” is always in control of the hunting area and is fully integrated into the day-to-day operations of the project but at the same time is protected from the financial risks involved in the venture. It is also important that the entrepreneur be assured that his/her assets and investments will be fully protected and that the venture can be successfully implemented.

The disadvantage of this approach is that the negotiations can be protracted and there is the possibility that the final agreement may foreclose options for the community for an extended period of time. In addition, the agreement can contain complicated legal jargon that the community may find difficult to understand. Adopting this approach therefore requires careful planning to ensure that the interests of the community are protected. Often such agreements are negotiated using an independent broker who has a thorough understanding of the hunting industry to ensure that a win-win situation is arrived at.

The following table summarises the type and duration of various agreements:

Type of Agreement	Duration	Advantages	Disadvantages
Single Lease Fee <i>Applicable to both hunting and photographic operations</i>	Annual with option to renew	Easy to administer	Price can be undervalued Limited investment by operator Difficult to demonstrate linkages between Lease Fee and value of resource Little security of tenure Creates instability in the industry

Fee paid for each animal shot <i>Applicable to hunting operations only</i>	Up to 3 years with option to renew	Easy to administer Linkages between value of wildlife and conservation can be demonstrated. Fees can be negotiated in US\$ for foreign based companies. Attractive to recreational hunters	High risk of undervaluing wildlife resource Community may not receive maximum potential income if animals not hunted Little security of tenure Little incentive to invest in management
Percentage of gross income <i>Applicable to hunting and photographic operations</i>	Up to 5 years for hunting operation Up to 10 years for photographic operation Both with option to renew	Incentive for the community and outfitter to work together is high. Both parties benefit during good years Encourages development of concession Suitable for tender system	Requires a high level of understanding of business environment. Community can be prejudiced in poor years unless safeguards are built into the agreement. Can be difficult to administer and monitor
Negotiated Joint Venture <i>Applicable to hunting and photographic operations</i>	Up to 10 years for hunting operation Up to 15 years for photographic operation Both with option to renew	Possible to develop an agreement to suit a specific situation. Responsibilities of both parties clearly defined. Provides security of tenure Rights of both parties protected Can be lucrative for both parties. Improved wildlife management Engenders stability in the industry. Suitable for tender system	Can take time to negotiate and develop the agreement. Requires thorough understanding of business environment. Usually requires professional expertise to negotiate the agreement. Potential to foreclose future options is high

Options for Awarding Contracts

The options available to communities for awarding contracts are confined to one of the following:

Direct negotiation with a prospective investor
Open Competitive Tender
Open Auction

Each of these options has advantages and disadvantages, and the approach can be modified to suit particular circumstances (*e.g.* qualified tender or auction).

Advantages and Disadvantages of Direct Negotiation: This option usually involves an investor approaching a community directly to negotiate a contract to exploit an opportunity in their area without having to formally tender.

The advantage of this approach is that the community does not have to invest any effort or finances into preparing any documentation to market its wildlife resources. On the part of the investor, the advantage is that competition from other potential investors is removed.

This approach also allows the two parties to conclude their negotiations without the pressure from other investors and this provides both parties with the opportunity to discuss the various

contractual issues in an amicable environment. Furthermore, unless the proposed contract includes complicated clauses, there is no need to involve third parties in these negotiations.

The major disadvantage of this method is that there is a high risk that the community may not receive the maximum value for the concession. In addition, there is a high risk that the community could foreclose options if the duration of the lease is for an extended period. This is particularly the case where hunting concessions are concerned.

Advantages and Disadvantages of an Open Auction System: Under this system the concession areas are advertised, providing background information regarding the details of the area, duration of contract and contractual arrangements. Potential investors are given an opportunity to visit the area to assess the situation on the ground, and to query any issues regarding the terms and conditions of the contract. The potential bidders are then invited to attend a public auction where the highest bidder secures the concession.

The suitability of this of this option depends upon the management objectives for the concession concerned. If the management objective is to maximise revenues, and ensure transparency, then this is the best system to use. However, if there are other management criteria for the concession (such as award to a concessionaire with a good track record, or the community require certain management programmes and or social services to be undertaken by the concessionaire), then this may not be the most appropriate mechanism.

The advantage of the open auction system addresses the issue of transparency and is relatively simple to administer. This system also clears the market and establishes the market value for the concession. There is also the added advantage that the investor is required to pay the full amount on securing the concession unless special conditions are negotiated.

The major disadvantage of this system is that the auction system is open to all potential investors. The community cannot therefore select the “best” partner in the joint venture. In addition, it is difficult to impose conditions through a contractual arrangement unless these have been clearly described to all participants prior to the auction. Even so, there is still the risk that the winning bidder may still want to negotiate the terms and conditions of the contract and this could delay the implementation of the project.

Another disadvantage is the fact that because the highest price has been paid for the concession, there may be a tendency for the successful bidder to attempt to maximise revenue generation from the concession e.g. shoot all the animals on quota and be less inclined to invest in the area or spend money on management activities.

There is also the risk that objections from the domestic industry may be raised if the auction is open to foreign bidders even though this could generate the maximum revenues.

Advantages and Disadvantages of an Open Competitive Tender: The most common method of awarding contracts is through an open competitive tender system. This approach does, however, require a certain amount of background preparation in order to be successful. For example, the community will have to decide exactly what it wants to sell, and will have to make decisions regarding:

- What animals are to be hunted
- Where hunting will take place
- The duration of the agreement
- The structure of the agreement
- The minimum value of the tender
- How the tender will be marketed (advertising, contact with the industry etc.).

How the tenders will be evaluated.

The community should also be aware that potential investors would require a certain amount of background information regarding the hunting area on which to structure their bid. To accommodate this, an information package can be prepared that provides the following information:

A covering letter explaining the contents of the information pack and the proposed agreement.

The full hunting quota (and the minimum value that the community expect for the quota)
Any other base fees that the tenderer will be expected to pay (e.g. bed levy, concession fee etc.)

Description of the area, including a map that indicates the boundaries

Date by which the tender is to be submitted

A standard tender form that provides background information regarding the company, its directors, professional guides/hunters etc.

The advantage of the open competitive tender system is that it will clear the market and provide all potential investors with an equal opportunity to secure a concession area. This method will also provide the opportunity to determine the market value for the hunting area on offer and thus the community can be assured that it will receive the maximum income for the area. It also allows the community some flexibility in awarding the tender, and they do not necessarily have to accept the highest bidder. Another advantage is that the concession can be awarded on the basis of criteria other than financial. This system is greatly improved by insisting that technical and financial proposals be submitted separately. Furthermore the community is not obliged to accept any or the highest offer if the proposals do not meet their requirements.

The disadvantage of this system is that, unless there are specific restrictions put in place, anybody can participate in the tender. This means that the community may enter into a contract with a potential investor who knows very little about the industry and therefore will fail to meet their commitments.

The process is also not transparent and can leave the organisation exposed to allegations of corruption unless specific conditions are put in place to mitigate against this. Furthermore, the selection process can be problematic if the tenders offer a wide range of benefits that are difficult to assess. There is also the risk that the revenues raised through the tender system may not be as high as under the auction system.

Marketing of Sport Hunting

A wide range of strategies are adopted by professional outfitters to market their hunting operations. Attempting to discuss these in any detail or draw comparisons between the different countries is therefore extremely difficult. Therefore the approach used here is to discuss the broad principles that exist, using Zimbabwe as a case study, and comparing this with the strategy adopted in Tanzania.

General marketing strategies

The strategy adopted by the safari industry has been to earn the bulk of its income from the daily rate of the hunting package. This makes sense because the client only pays for what is shot/wounded (unless it is an all inclusive package hunt). The split between daily rate and trophy fees has therefore been approximately 60:40. Those operators that have attempted to attract clients by offering low daily rates and then loading the trophy fees have generally not survived in the industry simply because the clients do not necessary shoot a large number of

animals (Booth *et al. In Prep*).

The success of the sport hunting industry in Zimbabwe is a result of three factors:

The continued decline of the Zimbabwe dollar.

The improved efficiency with which trophy animals are converted to gross income.

The increased availability of hunting areas and thus animals.

Initially the growth of the industry was not limited by demand – in fact both the supply and the price increased simultaneously (Child, 1988). This trend continued through to the 1990's however, the industry grew in *volume* rather than *value*. The reasons for this are complex as there are many factors that impact on the final overall value of the hunt. These are:

Duration	
Daily rate	
Trophy fees	
Mix of trophies	Value of safari
Quality of hunting area	
Marketing strategies	
Competition (local industry and externally)	

The bottom line is that a hunting client is only prepared to pay a fixed amount for a hunt, and this amount only varies depending on the type of hunt and species on offer. The success of the outfitter therefore depends on his skill and reputation to “sell” the hunt at above market prices, for this will determine the success of the operation and whether the maximum return will be generated from a set quota of animals.

It would appear however that the industry is not in control of all the market forces and as a result has not been able to increase the price of the basic earning instruments (daily rate and trophy fees) except in special circumstances. The demand for hunting continues to remain strong as shown by the steady increase in the number of hunter days and animals taken each year. The challenge for the safari hunting industry as a whole is therefore to understand these market forces and ensure that its “product” is not being under sold.

It is generally accepted that including one or more big game trophy animals with a basic plains game safari can enhance the overall value of a hunt. For example, Child (1984) demonstrated that the inclusion of a buffalo in a plains game safari allowed the operator to increase the daily rate from US\$250 to US\$400. In addition, the duration of the safari could be extended from 10 days to 15 days. The overall impact was to increase the overall value of the safari from US\$ 2,500 to US\$6,000.

The primary objective of most hunting areas is to generate sustainable income from the utilisation of wildlife. This is achieved by using the services of a professional hunter/operator to market and sell a quota of animals at a rate determined by the market. In Zimbabwe, the *licence fee* for all trophy animals on State-run concessions is determined by the PWMA and these are set in advance of the hunting season. The outfitter is required to pay these licence fees to the wildlife authority on behalf of the client. However, in practice, the operator purchases the licences and sells these on as a *trophy fee* to the hunting client, usually at a profit. Generally the operator is not refunded for animals that are not shot/wounded.

The situation on private land is slightly different in that the landowner has full access rights to all wildlife on the property and thus is not required to purchase licences for animals that are hunted. This principal also applies to Forestry and CAMPFIRE areas. As a result, the landowner recovers 100% of the trophy fee that are generally aligned to the PWMA license fees.

The *value* of the trophies on State Land is therefore determined by the State, usually after taking market trends into consideration. Unfortunately the PWMA does not keep abreast of the market prices and very often either sets prices above or below the market price. In addition, the prices are often set for 3-year periods in order to accommodate the marketing of the safaris by operators on State Land concessions. Private sector operators take their cue from these fluctuations and adjust their prices accordingly.

The wildlife agencies, however, have no control over the daily rate charges set by the operator – the market forces prevailing within the industry drive these. The following diagram illustrated the relationship between the market forces active in the industry:

The Wildlife Agency: The wildlife agency, in this case the PWMA, is responsible for determining the value of all wild animals in the Parks and Wild Life Estate. These *Licence Fees* are gazetted periodically, often after consultation with the safari industry. The PWMA can therefore regulate the value of the wildlife resources under its control. These prices are driven by the following market forces:

- Scarcity of the trophy.
- Availability of the trophy.
- Demand for the trophy.
- Quality of the trophy.
- Comparable prices elsewhere in the country and in the region.
- Any legal implications (CITES permits, veterinary restrictions etc).
- Magnitude of the concession fee or “right to hunt” fee.

These prices therefore become the benchmark against which future increases are determined.

The Safari Outfitter/Landowner: Safari outfitters who are responsible for running and conducting the hunt will either purchase the animals from the PWMA or from the landowner. These animals are then “sold” to the hunting client as part of the trophy bag, usually for a profit. However, the client only pays for the animals that he shoots/wounds during a hunt.

The *economic value* of the *Trophy Fee* is therefore determined by the outfitter and is arrived at after taking into account the following market forces:

The number trophies on quota.

Trophy quality.

Duration of the safari.

Comparable prices elsewhere within the industry and the region.

The number of confirmed bookings.

Time of season (early and late season bookings are often discounted).

Mix of trophy bag.

Previous track record (hunter success, trophy prices).

Cost of the hunting operation (concession fees, licence fees, operational costs).

Furthermore, as hunts are often booked up to a year in advance, the outfitter is required to negotiate the overall cost of the safari and fix the *Trophy Fee* well in advance of the season. The skill of selling the overall hunt to the client is therefore crucial to the success of the operation.

The Hunting Client: The role of the client is obviously crucial as to whether the contract is signed or not. With the wide range of options available, the client is ideally positioned to negotiate the most cost effective arrangement. In most cases the hunting client will thoroughly research the type of hunt that he is seeking, including the list of trophies, before he commits himself. The market forces at play in this instance include:

Eagerness for a particular trophy.

Whether it is his/her first safari to Africa.

The overall amount that he/she is prepared to spend (including airfares and taxidermy costs).

Reputation of the country as a hunting destination.

Reputation of the safari operator.

Reputation of the particular hunting area.

Whether he/she already has a specimen of the particular trophy.

Quality of trophies.

Success rate in hunting a particular species in a particular area.

Only after taking all these factors into consideration will the potential client consider the cost of the trophy fees. However, in doing so, he/she will also compare costs between safari outfitters and between countries before deciding where to place the deposit.

The Daily Rate: The daily rate charged by the safari outfitter is the one aspect of the negotiations over which he has total control. Determining the baseline level for the daily rate depends on the minimum number of hunter days that an operator is required to achieve in order to break even. For example, if the operating costs are US\$30,000 per annum then it will require 100 hunter-days at US\$300/day to generate this amount of money. Generating 100 hunter-days will depend on the size and mix of the trophy quota to be marketed. For example, 10 x 10-day hunts or 6 x 15-day + 1 x 10-day hunts etc. The composition of the quota is therefore extremely important as this dictates the marketing strategies of the outfitter. Ideally the quota should be “balanced” by offering attractive packages.

This is the reason why it is critically important that the safari operator markets the trophy quota efficiently. Offering too many animals in the bag will result in the operator not generating sufficient hunter-days. In contrast offering too few animals or animals at high trophy fee rates will equally result in insufficient hunter-days being sold. Determining the balance is the key to a successful safari operation. Generally it is accepted that plains game safaris will fetch up to US\$300/day while big game safaris can demand in excess of US

\$1,000 (depending on the area, trophies and operator reputation).

Classic marketing strategies

Individual sport hunts were originally marketed according to a 21-, 15-, 10-, and 7-day period. The classic 21-day hunt allowed the client to hunt a full bag of the big game (elephant, lion, leopard and buffalo). This strategy has been officially adopted by some countries, notably Tanzania, that markets its sport hunting industry through packaging hunts into 21-, 16-, 14- and seven-day safaris. For example tourist hunters that intend to hunt the more charismatic species such as elephant, gerenuk and roan must undertake and pay for a 21-day safari permit. A minimum of seven days is needed to hunt buffalo (two permitted on license) and selected plains game, and 16 days for a lion, sable and three buffalo (PAWM, 1995).

Licenses for 21-day hunt are the most popular with the client as this facilitates full access to all the animals available on license (over 70 species) but this does not necessarily mean that the hunter intends to take all the species available. This system is also popular with the outfitters and government as it tends to increase the number of hunting days and consequently the daily rate and other hunting fees.

Training and Licensing of Professional Hunters

The qualifications of professional hunters in Namibia, Botswana and Zimbabwe are regarded as the highest in the SADC region. Both government and the respective Professional Hunters Associations take unethical behaviour by their members seriously, and also advise government on disciplinary cases of non-members.

Botswana maintains the quality of its sport hunting industry by demanding a high standard of professional hunters, and by imposing minimum trophy export sizes that help to protect Botswana's reputation as a quality trophy destination. Professional and ethical sport hunting standards are maintained in Botswana through the administration of hunters and guides licenses. These licenses are categorised into three levels of proficiency, namely trainee hunter, assistant professional hunter and full professional hunter. Only full professional hunters are allowed to become outfitters for foreign clients and assistant professional hunters can only become full professional hunters after three years experience.

Obtaining a license requires considerable practical and theoretical training on ethical hunting behaviour, modalities of effective hunting, and tourism service provision. Under the Licensing and Hunting Regulations (2001) a pre-requisite for the hunters' theoretical exams is attaining proficiency in a shooting marksmanship practical exam.

The Namibia *Nature Conservation Ordinance No. 4 of 1975* outlines the qualifications and expected standards of ordinary hunting guides, master hunting guides, and professional hunters. In brief, these require that an ordinary hunter be tested, both practically and theoretically. After two years experience and a minimum of 12 sport hunting excursions, the hunter may apply and be tested for master hunter. Similarly, professional hunters need two years experience as a master hunter and must again be tested in theory and practice on all aspects pertaining to sport hunting.

The Namibia Professional Hunters Association (NAPHA) has established a Disciplinary Sub-Committee, which addresses unethical hunting behaviour of its members (over 400 members), and insist that members hunt according to the ethical principles stipulated in its Hunting Code.

In Zimbabwe there are three organisations that deal with professional outfitters and hunters.

The Zimbabwe Professional Hunters and Guides Association (ZPHGA) focuses on the needs of professional hunters while the Zimbabwe Association of Tour and Safari Operators (ZATSO) caters for outfitters. All outfitters are required to be registered with the Zimbabwe Tourism Authority (ZTA), and are obliged by law to employ a licensed Professional Hunter or Guide to accompany a client on either a hunting or photographic safari. Professional Hunters and Guides undergo a two year training “apprenticeship” and must pass a number of examinations before being granted one of three licences by the National Parks and Wildlife Authority:

Learner Professional Hunters Licence,
Full Professional Hunters Licence
Professional Guides Licence.

The Director General (of the PWMA) may also issue a Restricted License that limits the areas in which the hunter/guide may operate in instances where the professional hunter/guide does not have sufficient experience, particularly involving dangerous game such as buffalo and elephant.

The Learner Professional Hunter: Any person over the age of 18 who is a Citizen or permanent resident of Zimbabwe and in possession of a First Aid Certificate may apply to PWMA to sit the Learner Hunter Exams. The Zimbabwe Professional Hunters and Guides Association (ZPHGA) in conjunction with the PWMA have prepared a training package to assist Learner Hunters with the requirements to prepare for these exams. PWMA has also prepared an extensive syllabus covering the legal requirements relating to hunting (Parks and Wildlife Act, Trapping of Animals Control Act, Park and Wildlife General Regulations, Parks and Wildlife Import and Export Regulations, Firearms Act, Development of Tourism Act, Forest Act and any Statutory Instruments relating to tourism) as well as the requirements relating to the understanding of basic ecological and veld management (basic botany, animal behaviour, descriptions and feeding habits, reproduction, vegetation, insects, reptiles and fish).

The twice yearly examination consists of written papers varying from 90 minutes to 2 hours covering law, habits and habitat, firearms and general knowledge.

Upon passing these exams, a Learner Professional Hunters Licence is issued, and the licence holder is then required to register with a fully qualified Professional Hunter for a period which will enable him to acquire the skills and experience of the hunting industry. This usually involves a period of not less than 2 years.

Under the tutelage of the Professional Hunter, the Learner Hunter may conduct plains game hunts, but under no circumstances is a Learner Hunter permitted to conduct a safari in an area in which dangerous game occurs or hunt dangerous game unless he is accompanied by a professional hunter. All hunts are registered in a log book that provides details of the hunting company, professional hunter, client name, location and type of the safari, dates and record of the animals shot/wounded during that time (i.e. own shot, shot under supervision, accompanied hunt etc.). The Professional Hunter is required to complete and sign the log book, commenting on the proficiency of the Learner Hunter during at particular safari.

During the 2-year apprenticeship, the Learner Hunter is expected to gain experience in all aspects of the safari hunting industry. This will include:

Camp building, maintenance and provisioning
Skinning and trophy preparation
Administration and documentation
Client relations

Accompanying hunts (initially not conducting a hunt)
Improvement of personnel hunting experience, particularly the hunting of dangerous game
Building blinds
Vehicle maintenance
Tracking and bush-craft skills
Trophy measurements
Firearm skills
General knowledge

It is also suggested that the tutors make six-monthly assessments of their apprentices, and encourage them to participate in any training courses run by the ZPHGA. Having completed this apprenticeship, the Learner Hunter may register to sit the Full Professional Hunter Licence exam.

The Full Professional Hunter: At the end of the 2-year period, and provided that he/she has gained sufficient experience with the hunting of dangerous game, the Learner Hunter is required to undergo a "Shooting Test" under the auspice of the Zimbabwe Shooting Federation and pass an Advanced First Aid Course. The Learner Hunter is then required to present the completed Log Book plus all other documentation to the PWMA who is then interviewed on various aspects of hunting. On the recommendations of PWMA, together with input from ZPHGA, the Learner Hunter is required to undertake a proficiency test.

The proficiency test is usually conducted over a period of 6 - 7 days in the field, and is run jointly between the PWMA and the ZPHGA who appoint examiners. During the field test, the candidates are expected to undertake the following practical tasks:

Set up a safari camp and cater for "clients": This normally involves setting up a tented camp, including all ablutions and catering for the "client". The candidate is examined on site selection, layout of the camp, camp hygiene, camp management etc.

Prepare for a hunting safari: The candidate is examined on his ability to prepare for a hunting safari. This includes vehicle preparation, appropriate licences, interpretation of maps and map reading, weapons, first aid box, trophy handling and client requirements. The candidate will also be checked to determine whether he is carrying the correct rifle and grade of ammunition for the particular hunt, including that of his client.

Conduct a hunt and, if required shoot an elephant or buffalo: This is usually the most important aspect of the proficiency test. The candidate is expected to guide the examiners into a position where he would recommend that the "client" shoot an elephant or buffalo. During this test, the candidate is examined on his skill in locating the trophy, his rapport with his tracker, interpretation of bush signs, use of wind and ash bags, use of cover and the manner in which he handles the client during the stalk. He will also be examined on his ability to judge trophies in the field. In some instances the candidate will be required to kill an elephant or buffalo. He is then examined on the anatomy, shot placement, handling of the trophy and trophy recovery.

Build leopard/lion blinds and set up bait: The candidate is examined on his ability to "read" the movements of predators and select a site to construct a blind. Usually he will be questioned on his approach to setting bait for either a leopard or lion.

Prepare trophies: The candidate is required to prepare various capes of animals shot. This may involve shoulder mounts, skull preparation, salting of the hide and disposal of the meat products. The candidate will also be questioned on the requirements to export the trophies (permits, dipping, packing etc.).

Track and identify the spoor of a wide variety of animals: During the course of a hunt, the candidate will be examined on his understanding of spoor, and will be required to identify the various spoor encountered. He will also be required to distinguish between different blood spoors.

Identify fauna and flora as required: The candidate is expected to identify mammals, birds, reptiles, amphibians and the vegetation in the area, describing their habits and uses where applicable.

First aid: Usually the examiners simulate an accident that will test the first aid skills of the candidates.

Other topics: In addition to the above, the examiners will question the candidates at length during the course of the examination on a wide variety of topics such as ballistics and rifle maintenance, vehicle maintenance, general knowledge regarding Zimbabwe and weapon safety.

Only if the candidate passes this Proficiency Test is he issued with a Full Professional Hunters Licence which is required to be renewed annually on payment of the appropriate licence fee.

Monitoring of the Sport Hunting Industry

Monitoring of the sport hunting industry relies on the analysis of hunting permits and licenses that are returned by the safari outfitters. Extensive analysis of these documents has been completed for Tanzania, Botswana, Namibia and Zimbabwe. The quality of the information naturally depends on the accuracy of the data provided by the outfitters. Two examples from Tanzania and Zimbabwe are provided here.

Tanzania

A hunting database was developed for the SGR in 1999 that was later simplified to operate solely on MS Access 2000, and to accommodate hunting data from other game reserves in Tanzania (Cauldwell, 2004). The database stores data from hunting permits, which are separated into the following logical components:

Client details: Permit number; Client's name; Nationality; Hunting company; Professional hunter; Game scout accompanying client; Repeat permit (yes/no); Start and end dates of hunting safari; Number of observers.

Weapons brought by the client (up to 5)

Animals hunted: Type of animal; Hunting block; GPS coordinates (UTM: Northings & Eastings or other formats)

Hunting quota

Trophy measurement data is recorded according for 5 trophy types, i.e. antelope, boss-types, crocodiles, predators and tuskers.

The database includes some basic analysis and has extensive capability for summarisation of data (number of hunting clients per year, total income generated from conservation fees, permit fees, trophy fees etc.). Lists of trophy data for the five basic trophy types are presented.

A DOS-based database (DataEase) was developed in the early 1990's by the PAWM project with funding from USAID and approximately 7,200 hunting permits were entered for the whole of Tanzania for the period from 1988 to 1993. Unfortunately this initiative was not

maintained after 1993. Data relevant to the SGR was extracted from the PAWM database and added to the Selous hunting database and all additional permits from the Selous that could be located were entered. The database has been kept up to date by staff of the SGR, and contained 5,845 hunting permits for the period 1988 to 2003. A total of 35,541 animals of 41 different species are recorded having been hunted on these permits.

Zimbabwe

The monitoring and administration system used in Zimbabwe evolved from the experiences gained in the management and administration of the Matetsi Parks and Wildlife Complex. This Safari Area was intensely managed by the (then) Department of National Parks and Wildlife Management (DNPWLM) that established the Matetsi Research Unit (MRU) in 1973. The primary purpose of this research unit was to monitor all aspects of sport hunting conducted on seven concessions, including neighbouring private properties.

Systems were developed to monitor trends in trophy quality and age (it was compulsory for all trophies to be presented for inspection), population trends were monitored through annual aerial and road strip count surveys, and data on the performance of the various hunting operations was gathered through a comprehensive permit system that provided data on trophy prices, daily rates, hunter days, kill locations etc. Specific management and research programmes were also conducted e.g. fire and artificial water management, species specific research programmes etc.

From these data it was possible to closely monitor and fine tune the management and administration of the hunting operations to the point where it was possible to reduce the overall quotas by almost two thirds yet increase the performance of the hunting operations in terms of hunter days achieved by three fold (Booth, unpublished data).

The key to the success of this management and administrative system was the establishment of a dedicated research unit and the fact that simple procedures were developed and maintained (the “Matetsi System” has not altered significantly since its inception and now represents some 35 years of continuous monitoring of sport hunting in this area), and that the data were regularly analysed.

It is unfortunate that this system was not rolled out to the remaining DNPWLM controlled Safari Areas. Instead, the Department introduced a plethora of forms and permits (nine in all) that safari operators were required to fill out and submit to various government departments for each hunting excursion. Most forms duplicated information that led to a cumbersome and bureaucratic system. Worse still most of the information was not analysed in any way, and the apathy of the industry to complete all these forms meant that essential information was lost either because the forms were not filled in correctly, not submitted or simply lost.

Of all the data collection forms used, the “NP9 form” provides the most accurate measure for assessing the foreign sport hunting sector in Zimbabwe. This form was developed initially at Matetsi to capture both financial and biological information. It was taken a step further by the Department when it became a legal requirement for all safari operators to complete this form and have a local bank verify that the full foreign currency value of the hunt had been deposited in Zimbabwe. Only after this was completed was the CITES Export Permit issued by National Parks together with the Customs “CD1” export permit that allowed the clients trophies to leave the country.

The NP9 form provides valuable information on the economic performance of the sport hunting industry in terms of trends in gross income, gross number of hunter days, number of safaris and gross number of animals shot, and duration of safari, but it does not address any

of the biological parameters (age, trophy quality) nor does it provide a means of determining the distribution of hunting (State concessions, CAMPFIRE Areas, private land) or the type of hunting (ranch, bow, big game).

Furthermore, capturing and analyzing the data from the NP9 form demands that the (now) PWMA has this capacity. Until recently, this was facilitated by the WWF – SARPO office in Harare that provided funding to develop and capture the data (Booth, 2001).

The PWMA have attempted to address these issues by developing a more streamlined data gathering form, known as the TR2. This form essentially captures all the information that was contained on the NP9 form, but now includes a proviso that the form must be completed prior the arrival of the client, and that particular hunt must be approved by PWMA before the hunt commences. On completion of the hunt, the form is signed by the client and the professional hunter responsible for the hunt, and the document processed through the bank and PWMA before the export permit is issued. The issue of data capture and analysis still presents a problem to the authorities however.

Botswana

DWNP has received considerable support from international donors, NGOs, and private sector management bodies in supporting the monitoring and regulation of the sport hunting industry. The Botswana Wildlife Management Association (BWMA) represents the interests of commercial safari outfitters in Botswana. BWMA aims to promote a well-regulated, sustainable, but financially-viable sport hunting industry in State, communal and free-hold ranch land. Within State and free-hold ranch land, the BWMA is the main external body that supports DWNP in managing sport hunting, as free-hold ranch owners have not as yet organized themselves into an active wildlife producer association.

The CBNRM initiative received considerable assistance from the international donor community (USAID, NORAD, and SNV) in the 1990's and early 2000. With the termination of virtually all of these donor-funded programmes, the CBNRM programme was handed over to the Community Services Division of the DWNP. The exception to this is the Wildlife Conservation and Management Programme funded by the European Union (EU) that is scheduled to end in 2007. One component of this programme supports CBNRM initiatives, including the implementation of a community-based Management Orientated Monitoring Systems (MOMS). This system is designed to build the capacity of local communities to monitor trends in animal populations and hunting activities in their areas using simple parameters recorded in the field.

The Botswana Community-Based Organisation Network (BOCOBONET) was formed in 1999 to promote the interests of its CBO members by playing a mediating and advocating role between communities and service providers, including government, private sector, NGOs and training institutes. This NGO received considerable donor support, especially from IUCN, but with the withdrawn of donor funding, it is no longer as active as it once was.

BWMA instigated a trophy quality-monitoring programme to record trends in commercially hunted animals. Trophy quality is a good indicator of the population status of animals hunted. If trends in trophy quality are consistently high, it indicates that the status of the population is good, and hunting off-take (of all types) is sustainable. If the trend in trophy quality is consistently decreasing, it indicates that the status of the population is declining and off-take quotas should be reviewed. Monitoring of trophy quality in Botswana commenced in 1997 and recorded data from some 90% of all sport hunted trophies. The analyses of these data are provided to DWNP to assist in making sound management decisions in the allocation of quotas. However, the sustainability of this programme is dependent on the

voluntary commitment of BWMA. DWNP have not yet taken over this responsibility and although attempts have been made to train local DWNP staff to assume this responsibility, this has not been formally implemented.



MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION OF SPORT HUNTING IN SELECTED EUROPEAN COUNTRIES

Norway

There are five different species of ungulates in Norway that are hunted and most have shown steady increases in numbers over the last 30 years. Moose and red deer populations have shown the largest growth both in numbers and distribution due to changes in forestry, agricultural and management practices. Selective harvesting of mostly young (calves and yearlings) and older males allows for annual hunting bags for these species of approximately 38,000 and 25,000, for moose and red deer respectively. The roe deer population has also increased after being reduced to a single population in southern Sweden around 1850. The annual hunting bag of 20,000 to 35 000 animals varies depending on the severity of the winter.

Legislation: The policy and Wildlife Act promote sustainable use of wildlife and the habitats in order to ensure the productivity and conservation of Norway's species diversity. The overall management strategy is based on the concept of integrated ecosystem management. The wildlife agencies are organised in four levels: Ministry of Environment, Directorate for Nature Management, County Governor and the Municipalities.

The *right of hunting* belongs to the landowner, and since the mid 1950's, a *wildlife board* within each municipality (434 in total) is responsible for issuing hunting licenses for moose, red deer and roe deer according to a minimum area per licence that is fixed by the regional authorities. Those landowners that have developed local management plans that have been approved by the municipal wildlife authorities are given preferential quota allocations depending on the area of the properties.

All potential hunters undertake a "once in a lifetime" hunter proficiency test in order to be registered. This is mainly a theoretical test and a practical guide into weapon handling with a high focus on security. In order to hunt big game requires that all hunters undertake a yearly shooting test which is in two parts: the first part is 30 shots spread over at least two different days with no qualified hits, and the latter is 5 shots with each of the hunter's big game weapons at a reindeer target at a distance of 100 meters. All 5 shots must hit within the area of vital organs (a 40 cm diameter circle).

Each hunter is required to pay a *hunter's fee* of Euro 40 (in 2004) in addition to an obligatory fee paid to the local municipality for each animal shot. This fee differs depending on species and the age. The hunter's fee is paid into a *wildlife fund* that reaches approximately Euro 7.5 million annually, which is used to fund wildlife management, research and monitoring activities across the country.

Management tools: Three basic methods are used to monitor and manage the wildlife populations:

Observation inventory (moose and red deer)

A monitoring programme (Moose, red deer and wild reindeer)

A national health monitoring programme (all cervids + musk ox).

The data are used to analyse the spatial and temporal variation in body condition, reproductive parameters, population density and sex and age structures. Systematic recording are collected by the hunters during the hunting season of sex and age from which several indices on population structure and density are calculated. The most important indices is the '*animals seen per hunter-day*' as an index of population density, and '*calves*

per female’ and *female per male*’ as indices of recruitment rate and adult sex ratios respectively. The moose observation index (moose seen per hunter-day) is able to predict a similar trend in the post-harvest population size in 84% of the cases, and is significantly linearly related both to pre- and post-harvest population size. Despite the crude sampling procedure and a high number of likely confounding variables (e.g. variation in weather, hunting skills, number of hunters, hunting methods, etc.) the observation indices are found to give precise information on the temporal development in population size and structure within a given area, provided that the number of observations is relatively high. In addition, the lower jaw is collected from each animal as a measure of skeleton size and for age determination. The reproductive measurements are based on analyses of female reproductive tracts, from where ovulation and pregnancy is determined by the presence and appearance of luteal structures.

Poland

There are six indigenous species to Poland and three introduced species, including two specially protected species (European bison and Chamois). The various populations are scientifically managed after many were reduced to low numbers in the 19th century. The rapid growth of the red deer population was supported by many reintroductions and currently numbers approximately 130 000 with an annual hunting bag of approximately 40 000. Roe deer is the most abundant deer species numbering approximately 650 000 animals of which approximately 150 000 are harvested each year. Wild boar population numbers about 160 000 due to the increased intensity of agriculture and improvement of shelter in crop fields. This population is kept in check by allowing managers to crop up to 80% of this population annually, despite significant annual changes in recruitment.

Legislation: Ungulate management in Poland is based on two acts: The Hunting Law (1995) and the Act on Nature Conservation (2004). The Hunting Law is exclusively devoted to hunting and the protection of the natural environment, including the protection of game animals. The Act on Nature Conservation focuses on maintenance of natural processes, ecological stability and biodiversity conservation. The Forest Act (1991) has the strongest influence on the habitat of ungulates.

The management and administration of all hunting falls under the Minister of the Environment, and all game animals are State property. The whole of Poland is divided into 5,112 hunting districts of not less than three thousand hectares which are leased by hunting clubs (93%) or managed by State Forests, the Polish Hunting Association (PHA) or other institutions for a period of not less than 10 years. The leaseholder is entitled to harvest game in these blocks in terms of the law. The leaseholder or manager of a hunting district is obliged to monitor damage done by wild boar, moose, red, fallow, and roe-deer in farm plantations and crops.

Every hunter (100 469) or hunting club (2 506) is required to be a members of the Polish Hunting Association. The annual membership fee is EUR45 (additional club fees are also paid if a hunter is a member of a hunting club). Anybody who intends to be a hunter has to undertake and pass a test, complete a minimum of one year as an active member of a hunting club, and pass a shooting and oral exam. To hunt male deer requires at least three years membership of a hunting club and an additional exam.

Management tools: Hunting districts have been merged to form *game management regions* in order to facilitate the better management of the ungulate populations. Coordinators are recruited from the State Forests Service who is responsible for organising the annual census (usually a drive and/or winter tracking but also the use observation cards and other empirical

methods) and coordinating the preparation of “annual shooting plans”. There are two types of plans: 1) annual shooting plans developed by leaseholders of hunting districts in consultation with the community council and approved by the forest district officer of the State Forests; 2) long-term game management plans that take into consideration the optimal management of populations of game animals and forest protection against damage done by those animals. These plans are developed by directors of regional boards of the State Forests in cooperation with *voivodes* and Polish Hunters’ Association. A selective deer shooting programme has been in operation for decades. Each deer trophy must be presented to a special commission consisting of representatives of Polish Hunters Association and State Forest that check that the animal has been shot in accordance with the permit issued.

The Czech Republic

Approximately 84% of the Czech Republic is zoned for hunting, and there are eleven ungulate species. Hunting is based on the selective harvesting through culling (predominantly old and sick animals and under-developed young animals) and harvesting of prime trophy animals. The annual hunting bag for roe deer has reached approximately 115 000 animals, for wild boar 80 000, for red deer 19 000, for fallow deer 9 000, for sika deer 7 000, for mouflon 6 000 and a few dozens for white-tailed deer and chamois.

Legislation: The Game Management Act supports the sustainable use of wildlife, and explicitly defines who, how, where, what and when can be hunted. In addition, there are regulations that define how to protect and breed game, how to establish a *hunting guild and ground*, how to control populations by prescribed harvest quotas, who will cover cost of damages, how to control health of harvested game and what fines are applicable. Other laws (such as veterinary law, environmental and nature conservancy law, etc.) are also incorporated in the Game Management Act.

Administration and management of the state agencies occurs at three levels. The highest level is the Ministry of Agriculture which incorporates the Department for Fishery, Hunting and Beekeeping that manages the whole country except areas of national parks. The Ministry of Environment is responsible for general nature conservancy and game management in national parks. The middle level is based on a regional authority that is associated with ten administrative districts into which the country is divided. Finally, as the lowest level of the organisation is at the local municipality.

Landowners create a *hunting guild* of minimum 500 ha to establish a *hunting ground* (5,613 hunting guilds are registered in the Czech Republic). The hunting guild can *rent the right to hunt* to a *Hunting Area User* who is required to undertake an annual census, and develop a harvest plan for the hunting ground. These plans are approved by the hunting guild, and passed for verification to the municipal authority of game management.

A *Hunting licence* is issued by the local state agency of game management to any person over the age of 16 who has passed a hunting and game management course. This is a “once in a lifetime” licence which is the passport into the hunters register (there are approximately 131 500 owners registered). Hunting permits for various game species are issued by the Hunting Area User to the person who has a hunting and firearm licence. In addition, he has to provide proof of a valid certificate of compulsory insurance. Government does not receive any income from the hunting of animals. Income is only generated from hunting and firearms licences, and the taxes paid by the leaseholders.

Management tools: These are based mostly on annual harvest plans and on selective hunting. The census is rudimentary and consists of noting and recording all animals seen during one particular weekend in spring. In addition there are compulsory reports of every

culled animal (species, sex, age and weight), and every harvested animal has to be tagged. Veterinary inspection of game is only compulsory when the meat is intended for market. The hunting period for all game ungulate species coincides with rutting season. Also winter feeding has been obligatory by the law for about 500 years and it is not based on animal biological needs. It is justified by hunters, because of significant changes in environment and of possibility to keep higher density of wildlife.

The British Isles:

Six species of deer are currently found in the wild state in Britain but only two of these (the red deer and roe deer) may be regarded as truly native. Deer of one or more species now occur in over 60% of all 10 km² x 10km² grid squares of the British Isles. There are in addition a number of established populations of feral goats, mostly in Wales and in Scotland and two recently-established (but very small) populations of wild boar derived as escapees from farms.

There are marked differences in the management strategies applied to the deer population that are a reflection of landownership patterns, and also a reflection in changes in the relative importance of other land-use interests, such as arable or livestock agriculture, or forestry, in different areas. Dependent on the local density and local objectives, deer may be managed primarily for sport, for control of damage to agriculture, forestry or conservation habitats or not managed at all.

Legislation: Scotland, the Republic of Ireland, Northern Ireland and England (including Wales) have completely independent administrative and legal systems. The laws governing the management and culling of deer are significantly different in the different countries. The main implications of these laws are to define who has the right to take or kill deer, to limit the type of weapons which may be employed (calibre and muzzle velocity/ energy) and also restrict the periods of the year when deer may be killed. But the legislation also covers other issues, such as welfare, live capture or movement of deer. Details vary from country to country (particularly in relation to prohibited seasons), but in essence, these different Acts prohibit the use of smooth bore guns (shot-guns) for killing deer except under very specific conditions. They also specify the minimum rifle which may be used, either in terms of calibre and muzzle energy (England and Wales) or by bullet weight, muzzle velocity and muzzle energy (Scotland and Northern Ireland). These laws also prohibit the use of any airgun, air rifle or pistol, cross-bows and other similar weapons as well as the use of drugs in the taking or killing of deer. Finally they make clear the definition of those who have the legal right to take or kill deer. This is usually the owner of the land, his/her legal tenant or others that have the written consent and authority of the landowner or occupier.

Under British legislation, deer are wild animals and belong to no one. Within the United Kingdom at least (Scotland, England, Wales and Northern Ireland) there is no State ownership of deer, nor state-control of management or culling. Thus management is not centrally controlled, or carried out under licence. Nor is there any central control over numbers which can be shot. For the vast majority of land area, management is carried out by, or on behalf of the individual owner for whatever objectives he or she may determine. This leads to an enormous variation in management practices and intensity in different areas, with some significant areas receiving no formal management at all.

In Scotland, the situation is slightly different. Management of deer in particular areas is to some extent coordinated by discussion/agreement of neighbouring landowners within a framework of *Voluntary Deer Management Groups*. Neighbouring landowners and other interest groups, such as the Forestry Commission, or State Nature Conservation organisation,

meet on a regular basis to discuss management issues affecting their local area and agree cull targets. At present, approximately 90% of the entire land area of Scotland is covered within one or other of over 50 of these Voluntary Deer Management Groups. Further, there is in Scotland a statutory (Governmental) organisation charged with coordination of deer management issues (the Deer Commission for Scotland), with actual legal powers to intervene in situations where it may be demonstrated that deer are causing significant damage to agriculture, forestry or conservation, or pose a threat to public safety. No such system exists elsewhere within the UK although there are moves to develop similar coordinating bodies in England and Wales

Because there is no formal coordination of deer management effort outside Scotland, there is likewise no formal structure for population census. Counts of open-moorland red deer are undertaken by the Voluntary Deer Management Groups in Scotland on an annual or biennial basis, but not all groups undertake such counts as regularly. Regular estimates of deer numbers or densities are carried out within the majority of state-controlled Forestry Commission woodlands, but again not necessarily all are counted on a regular basis. Otherwise, deer numbers are censused on an informal basis by private landowners, but the methods used are not coordinated, nor consistent. Population numbers of red deer on the open hill in Scotland are estimated by direct count (ground or helicopter). Numbers of other species, or deer in more concealing habitats such as woodland, are variously estimated by driven census, vantage point counts or dung pellet surveys.

The 'deer industry' provides very significant social and economic benefits through the provision of employment, sales of guns and ammunition, clothing, vehicles etc. While much recreational stalking is enjoyed by owners and occupiers of land, a number have developed significant commercial enterprises on deer stalking, or by 'letting' stalking opportunities to others that provides significant and important revenue to landowners or Management companies.

Austria

There are approximately 116,000 hunters registered in Austria, which is subdivided into 9 provinces. Each province has a separate hunting law that recognise *Hunting districts* that function as game management units. Hunting bags (in 2003) were: roe deer 285,000 head; red deer 47,000; chamois 26,000; wild boar 24,500; mouflon 2000; sika deer 500; ibex 460; fallow deer 440. Except for chamois, all the ungulate populations increased or at least remained stable during the last decade.

Ungulate stocks are estimated annually by the hunters in their districts. More intensive methods (e.g. pellet and track counts, infra red photography by helicopter etc.) are occasionally used at a local level. The most important information for planning the hunting bag is the intensity of browsing and debarking in forests, which is systematically monitored across the whole country by the public administration.

The district hunting system consists of 12,000 hunting districts with a minimum district size of 1.15 km² and a mean size of 7 km² per district, and the hunting rights are vested with the landowner. Wildlife management is regulated by hunting laws which means that the hunters are responsible for wildlife management. Preconditions for hunting are the hunting exam, the official hunting licence (about Euro70/annum), and a hunting permit (or lease) for a certain hunting district. Shooting plans exist for all ungulate species (except wild boar) in which the numbers have to be planned for each species, sex and age class.

Hunting in National Parks is called "*ungulate regulation*", and only parts of the park areas

are hunted in short periods of the year. Ungulate populations inside the park are mostly regulated by rangers (not by recreation hunters).

The instrument to coordinate the different interests in the intensely multiple-use landscape is the so-called *Wildlife Ecological Spatial Planning* (WESP), which is embodied in the hunting laws of some provinces. The principles of this integration strategy are (i) to define clearly the land-use aims for the various areas, (ii) to coordinate habitat and ungulate management regarding content, area, and time, particularly better cooperation between forestry and hunting, (iii) to include game as a factor in planning tourism and forestry, and (iv) to plan hunting and game preservation to match the local capacity of vegetation.

Overall ungulate management consists of three main sections: the habitat, the game population, and the tolerance level to game damage. These three sections are strongly interconnected and have to be balanced in a holistic view. Habitat management is done primarily by landowners, foresters and farmers, but hunters are primarily responsible for regulating the game populations. However, the off take levels are defined by landowners and the public administration.

Recently an assessment system called "*criteria and indicators for sustainable hunting*" was developed in Austria that defines the ecological, economic, and socio-cultural principles, criteria, and operational indicators. The results are published as a book and are also available via internet (www.biodiv.at/chm/jagd).

Spain

The main use of wild ungulates in Spain is through hunting and population numbers are maintained through habitat management practices that aim to control population size and structure, together with the type of hunting procedures. The main hunting modalities for ungulates are stalking and *montería*. *Montería* is a typical Spanish hunting procedure for big game, where several packs of dogs are released within a portion of about 500 hectares of forest or scrubland, from where they drive wild ungulates into the open where hunters wait at fixed points. Under the *montería* system each area is hunted only one day per year, and is used mainly for red deer and wild boar.

Game management and hunting in Spain depends on regional autonomic governments. As a result, there are 15 legal situations in continental Spain with little or no coordination at the national level. Hunting areas and game populations Northern Spain are generally larger than those in Southern Spain and are managed by public administration. The southern part of Spain is characterised by private estates in traditional livestock lands, relatively small management units (1,000-4,000 hectares) with more intensive management, in many cases surrounded by 2 meter high mesh fences.

Northern areas are characterised by the increase of wild boar and roe deer populations, with the associated problems of damages in agricultural lands and increased traffic accidents. Southern areas of Spain have also experienced an increase of wild boar and roe deer populations, but the main feature of these areas is the growing tendency towards a more intensive game management with red deer as main species, with many areas are being fenced so as to maintain high populations of red deer.

Game management and conservation: Management of game populations in Spain is a very recent phenomenon despite the long history of recreational hunting in that country. The general tendency now, especially in the south, is towards a more intensive management aimed at increasing productivity and profitability. A general tendency is to translate livestock practices to increase productivity and profitability of wild ungulates; however a

new approach called the “*quality of game management system*” is being developed by some regional administrations. Its aim is to promote the type of management more compatible with conservation, on the basis of: 1) Landowners can apply for a certificate of quality, 2) Regional government in agreement with a research institute evaluates and gives the certificate, 3) Main benefit for owners is the access to funds oriented to conservation and the launch of their products (game offer) to the market with a quality brand.

Italy

There are eight different species of ungulates in Italy, six of which are native. Following the modification of land use caused by a shift to industry from agriculture in the last 100 years, all ungulate species have increased significantly and are now wide spread across the country.

Hunting Legislation: The National Hunting Law has been abandoned and replaced with regional laws that give the responsibility to manage and administer hunting to the Provinces (103 in Italy). These regional laws allow for the establishment of *General Hunting Districts* or *Alpine District*. Hunters are registered and linked to a specific District(s) and are only entitled to hunt there.

Ungulate Management and Hunting: Common species (Roe Deer, Red Deer, Fallow Deer, Mouflon, Wild Boar and Alpine Chamois) are hunted but the rarer species (Apennine Chamois, Alpine Ibex, and the Sardinian population of Mouflon and Red Deer) are protected. The annual hunting bag is about 50,000 Roe Deer, 7,500 Red Deer, 12,000 Alpine Chamois and more than 200,000 wild boar.

Regular census of the ungulate species are undertaken but the census methods are very variable for all species except for Alpine Chamois for which total count by block counts is prevalent.

Land and Hunting Organization: Recreational hunting is the predominant form of hunting in Italy, but the game is not property of the landowner. This is mostly because the land properties are very small. Therefore, Italy recognised five different settings in land organization in relation to hunting:

North-Eastern Alps has mainly municipal reserves (mean size 3,200ha) where only the citizens of the municipality have the right to hunt;

North-Western Alps where there are *General Hunting Districts* and *Alpine Districts* (mean size for both about 60,000 ha) in many cases subdivided to *ungulate hunting districts* of about 5,000-20,000 ha;

Northern Apennine (including Tuscany, North Umbria and the Province of Pesaro-Urbino) where there are special small hunting district for each species (e.g. Roe Deer, Red Deer, Fallow Deer, Mouflon and Wild Boar) with an average size of between 6,000 ha and 15,000 ha;

Central and Southern Italy where there are only *General Districts* of about 170,000 ha;

Sicily and Sardinia where there are no Districts but only Wild Boar can be hunted is the only hunted species.

There are special examinations for hunters of Cervids and Bovids but not for Wild Boar hunting. Hunting fee for wild ungulates may vary between Euro200 and Euro400/year but in some areas single licenses of up to Euro2000 are paid for certain species.

Hunting practices: Wild Boar is mostly hunted with dogs, but all other ungulates are hunted only by stalking with rifles. Wild Boar can be hunted for 3 months from October to January, but all other hutable ungulates can be hunted for two months (October-November) but

season can be moved i.e. they can be hunted in August-September and/or in February-March.

KEY LESSONS OF RELEVANCE

Hunting in various forms occurs throughout Southern Africa. In its most basic form it meets the needs of rural communities through subsistence hunting. Regulation of this form of hunting is through a confrontational approach using a para-military force of government wildlife officers and game scouts that enforce laws and regulations designed to protect wildlife in protected areas, State and communal land, and on private land. Attempts to ban all forms of hunting, as in Kenya, have only succeeded in suppressing recreational and sport hunting – it has not suppressed illegal and/or subsistence hunting. The consequences have been a drastic decline in wildlife numbers outside of the protected areas as local communities develop alternative land use practices.

Where recreational and commercial sport hunting is encouraged, it has shown to have been an efficient and legitimate form of land use, contributing to conservation, national and local economies and the general well being of rural communities through CBNRM initiatives. However, its success or failure as a legitimate economic activity will be measured by the long term status of wildlife populations where sustainable hunting is practiced, particularly outside of protected areas. The issue is how to regulate this highly emotive yet lucrative sporting and recreational activity in a responsible and sustainable manner for the better conservation of wildlife.

Recreational and sport hunting has been practiced for many years in Tanzania, Zambia, Botswana, Namibia and Zimbabwe. Tanzania has the longest record where, apart from a brief period when it was closed in the 1970's, some form of recreational and sport hunting has existed since the 1900's. In the remaining countries organised recreational and sport hunting has only existed for less than a century. The success of the hunting industry in these countries has been the result of innovative policies and strategies. The key lessons from these countries are discussed below in the hope that they will assist with formulating a coherent and comprehensive strategy for regulating the hunting industry in South Africa.

Ethics and Codes of Conduct

Codes of Conduct and the ethics of hunting are well established, and in most Southern African countries these are embedded in the legal framework and constitutions of hunting institutions and associations. However, hunters in general are very bad in dealing with regulations and regulating authorities, especially where it is perceived that these regulations infringe upon their "rights" or potential to earn lucrative incomes.

As individuals, hunters generally have a broad understanding of the ethics and codes of conduct relating to hunting, but each have widely differing opinions and interpretations of these (sometimes) unwritten rules. In addition, the standards that exist in the various countries to implement these rules depend on the capacity of the wildlife agencies and the hunting fraternity. For example, no formal national organisation or association representing recreational hunters exists in Tanzania, Zambia and Botswana. In these countries hunting is regarded as a right and one only has to purchase a permit in order to hunt within the regulations set by government. Little effort is made to re-invest in the management and administration of recreational hunting that is highly subsidised through under valued pricing structures.

This is in contrast to the high profile commercial sport hunting industry that is regulated mainly through the respective wildlife agencies and hunting associations that represent professional outfitters and hunters. However, the effectiveness and capacity of these associations varies considerably depending on the resources available, and level of membership and professional management. Compulsory membership of such associations is

not a requirement, and therefore the membership of such associations generally only represents a small fraction of the hunting fraternity.

Enforcing codes of conduct is therefore problematic. Professional outfitters and hunters are required to be registered with the government authorities, but this does not apply to recreational hunters. Law enforcement officers play a role where sport hunting occurs in State controlled hunting areas or concessions, but it is almost impossible to police recreational hunting on privately owned land or in open access areas where there is little control. Equally it is very difficult for associations to police their members, or deal with non-members as they generally have no legal mandate other than their constitutions.

Policy and Legislation

The importance of a policy and legislative framework that devolves the right to hunt and “ownership” of wildlife to the lowest possible level cannot be under-estimated. Where this policy has been adopted, in Zimbabwe and Namibia for example, it is possible to demonstrate the halt in the decline of wildlife outside of protected areas. Regulated recreational and sport hunting has played a major factor in this process.

The role of government should therefore be to develop the regulatory framework that promotes the sustainable utilisation of wildlife, and where possible encourage the development of professional member organisations to develop and set standards for self regulation of recreational and sport hunting activities.

“Ownership” of Wildlife

In Europe and America, the basic principle is a user pay system primarily funded by legally required hunting (and fishing) license fees, excise taxes on manufacturers of firearms, ammunition, archery equipment and motor boat fuel taxes. The wildlife resource is not “owned” by any one person but is managed by the State or the landowner. Access to wildlife is through a license of some sort, but the *right to hunt* is retained by the landowner. Off takes can therefore be controlled either through limiting the number of licenses made available – the fewer licenses, the higher the value of the animal (e.g. big horned sheep), or off take can be controlled by limiting the length and spatial timing of the hunting season. Adaptive management techniques are used to monitor population trends, and quotas and hunting seasons are discussed in public forums, using all available data from the previous hunting seasons.

The trend in Southern Africa is either for the State to control all access to wildlife or devolve this to the landowner. There has been a concerted effort on the part of Zimbabwe and Namibia to devolve rights over wildlife to landowners. Tanzania, with its vast wilderness areas and robust wildlife resources, has resisted this paradigm shift and retained total control by government, even though there is considerable pressure from local communities to directly manage these resources. Similarly Botswana has not fully devolved access rights to communities and landowners, although there are mechanisms in place whereby communities do receive substantial incomes from the wildlife.

The dilemma facing Southern Africa is that many Africans consider hunting a right and not a privilege, which introduces a new dimension in the management and administration of hunting regimes. Changing this paradigm is the greatest challenge facing administrators in the future.

Management and Administration of Hunting

The management and administration of the sport hunting industry occurs at two levels: government in the form of the wildlife management agency that directly control subsistence, recreational and sport hunting; and at the level of the service provider in the form of the safari outfitters and professional hunters that actually market the “product”.

Government Administration

Across the region, the responsible authority for the management and administration of the hunting industry are the various government and parastatal wildlife agencies. This mandate is provided through the policy and legal environment that generally devolves a limited amount of responsibility to landowners and appropriate authorities. However, the policy environment is diffuse. In some countries (Botswana, Namibia, Tanzania) there are specific policy documents that address the management and administration of sport hunting, and this is translated into the various acts and regulations. In other countries, the tendency is to develop an overall policy for conservation and then capture specific issues relating to hunting in the various regulations.

In all cases however, it is difficult to identify a single department *within* any specific agency that has the overall responsibility for directly managing and administering this complex industry. Usually the responsibility is given to one or two individuals that coordinate administration, with various activities spread across different sections: law enforcement that manages the licensing of the professional hunters and clients, including the export of trophies etc.; permit section that issues permits for recreational hunting; research division that monitors population trends, trophy quality and suggest quotas etc.; tourism sector that monitors the performance of the industry (number of hunters, animals hunted, economic parameters etc.) and community extension/outreach departments that deals with community-based initiatives. Usually the individual persons have very limited resources, little experience or understanding of the industry and often there is limited continuity with the result that administrative and management systems are frequently changed. Clear strategies and policies are therefore essential for the stability of the hunting industry.

Recreational and Sport Hunting Associations

Recreational and sport hunting associations exist across the region, but differ considerably in their strength and effectiveness. There is also a tendency for such associations to represent the commercial sector rather than recreational hunters. The Zimbabwe Hunters Association is an exception. This association caters for citizen hunters, and fulfils an important role in linking the recreational hunter with opportunities to hunt in an ethical and sustainable manner. It also supports an active environmental education programme in which volunteers from the association conduct courses for schools and individual groups on a wide variety of subjects surrounding conservation and the role of sustainable hunting.

Introducing a more formal and professional system to regulate and monitor recreational and sport hunting outside of the government agencies in most of the Southern African countries is probably not feasible. Subsistence hunting will continue to be regulated through conventional law enforcement practices and development of CBNRM initiatives. However, restructuring recreational hunting will require substantial government support to create a positive policy environment that provides the incentives for recreational hunters to develop and invest in the institutions necessary to implement such policies. Botswana and Namibia have made the greatest strides to address the administrative problems associated with recreational hunting, however there is not the critical mass in most Southern African countries to warrant such initiatives nor is there the political will on the part of most government wildlife agencies to tackle this problem, preferring to maintain the status quo.

Sport hunting on the other hand can and should be restructured given the value of the industry. However, there is a general lack of cohesion, strategic thinking and planning at the sport hunting industry level. This position is made even more difficult by the lack of resources provided to the associations as well as the lack of a legal mandate to maintain standards and levels of professionalism. As a result, the industry has difficulty in attending to the interface between sport hunting, the regulatory authorities (both at home and abroad) and the general public. In particular, the industry has great difficulty in dealing with the interface between itself and the anti-hunting lobby, often relying on individual members to deal with this rather than hiring in expertise to assist in providing full-time skills. Very few associations will commission professional staff to investigate specific issues or invest in any long-term monitoring/research programmes related to sport hunting.

Community Involvement

The central issue in all the CBNRM initiatives in the region is land tenure and the ownership and management of the natural resources thereon. A thorough understanding of landownership, tenure systems and property rights is therefore essential for the success of the CBNRM programmes. Their effectiveness in the region is dependent on the level that proprietorship and incentives have been devolved to the lowest community level.

Probably the most rigid system is that currently being implemented is in Tanzania where a protracted process has to be followed before a community can gain authorisation to access wildlife in a Wildlife Management Area. The CAMPFIRE programme in Zimbabwe has centralised CBNRM by only devolving authority as far as the District Council level, and while Botswana has gone the furthest in transferring funds from hunting activities to communities through joint ventures, the DWNP still retains overall control over all wildlife. Namibia has embarked upon a programme that is probably the most effective in devolving authority to communities in the management of wildlife in a communal environment. This process is further strengthened by embedding this policy in the revised legislation.

There are many examples of the methods and instruments that facilitate the process for communities to engage with the private sector through joint venture arrangements. These vary from simple agreements to more complicated technical contracts that require some form of professional help to broker the agreement. However, although the contractual arrangements protect the communities to a large degree from the financial risks involved, they are still lacking in accommodating individual community members in the administration and management of hunting regimes.

There is still a great deal to learn in this regard, and perhaps there are alternative options and opportunities to be explored based on the administrative and management systems adopted in some European countries that could be adapted to facilitate the development of communal conservancies.

Monitoring the Performance of Hunting Industry

Various monitoring systems have been developed and implemented in all the Southern African countries but the capacity to manage a “permit system” and analyse the data is limited. In addition, the results of the data are rarely included in the decision making process, especially as there are no dedicated professional units within the organisations to coordinate this process. There is also reluctance on the part of the wildlife agencies and the industry to provide these data for public scrutiny.

Licence and Permitting Systems

The licensing and permit system applicable to the sport hunting industry is compulsory in all Southern African countries, and because these have to be acquitted before the trophies can be exported, there is generally a high rate of return. This is not always the case with the permit and licensing system used to manage recreational hunting. As a result, there are virtually no data on the performance of this form of hunting.

The major problem is the management of the permits after they have been returned. Generally the volume of permits and the various data fields that are recorded overwhelms the capacity of the organisation to accurately capture the data. There have been instances where this process has been handed over to the hunting associations or coordinated through a neutral NGO, but there is always an air of suspicion attached to these data analysis by government, especially when they are not in a position to verify the data. Overcoming this can only be achieved by improving the professionalism of the industry, and providing the necessary resources.

Quota Setting

The trend varies from “educated guesses” to detailed analysis based on several biological parameters (population estimates, age of trophies, trophy quality etc.). No perfect system is in place, and developing an ecological basis for setting quotas is not easy, especially given the capacity of many of the wildlife management agencies.

There is a tendency for biologists representing “producers” to concentrate on “sustainability” and “carrying capacity” whereas the professional outfitter (or “consumer”) is more interested in maximising the returns from the wildlife on the land. Where the landowner has the *right to hunt* and *ownership* of the wildlife, it is in the interest not to over hunt their wildlife. This is because, unlike South Africa, there is no extensive professional live capture industry in most Southern African countries. Restocking is therefore an issue, and depends on over flow from neighbouring protected areas or the management of wildlife populations on private properties.

The problem is getting data from the various survey techniques (aerial and ground) that can be reliably used to monitor sport hunting quotas. Aerial surveys for large conspicuous mammals such as elephant have been used extensively for management purposes, but these are not suitable for smaller animals. They are also expensive to conduct and require specialist input. Conducting ground surveys that provide better data for these animals (impala, kudu, warthog etc.) is feasible but can be prohibitive in terms of man hours and costs.

What is lacking are the development of other indicators that are easy to monitor (animals seen per kilometre travelled for example), and linking this to the economics of the hunting industry. For example, in Zimbabwe a strategy adopted in the Matetsi Parks and Wildlife Complex was to maximise the number of hunter days from the minimum quota utilisation i.e. the performance of the industry was linked to the number of hunts conducted and not the number of animals killed. Quota setting used several other parameters such as age and trophy quality to adjust numbers from one year to the next. But this required a dedicated research team to closely monitor the industry.

Training and registration of recreational and professional hunters

Registration and training of recreational hunters is not a requirement in the region, and there are no levies other than payments for firearm certificates and hunting permits. Organisation of recreational hunters is also lacking apart from a few exceptions, and no “once in a lifetime test” is required as is the case in Europe. Consequently there is virtually no information

available on the magnitude of recreational hunting in the region (numbers, animals taken, economic impact etc.).

In contrast, there are well developed training and apprentice systems for professional hunters. Zimbabwe and Namibia have developed wide ranging curriculum's that are used as templates for neighbouring countries. Professional hunters are registered with government authorities but there is no system in place to cross reference the credentials of professional hunters that work across the region. Consequently it is difficult to maintain common standards and regulate professional hunters than may have been censured for breaches in conduct in one country or another.

Marketing of hunts

Traditionally commercial hunting has been marketed according to a rigid system of 21-, 16-, 10- and 7- day safaris. Big game hunts (elephant, lion, leopard and buffalo) are usually sold on longer durations than plains game safaris and demand higher prices.

The “mix” and size of the quota allocation is therefore crucial for the success of selling hunts to the European and USA markets. The tendency has been to offer as many animals as possible on a particular safari, and to gain access to dangerous game. For this reason many outfitters based on private land attempt to secure access to concessions that have access to big game. The reason for this is that selling a 21-day lion hunt is far more lucrative than selling 5 – and 10 – day plains game hunts (kudu, impala etc.) where competition is high.

This can be demonstrated by examining the trends in the average trophy fees for plains game that have not increased significantly in more than 10 years. The exception is the trophy fee for elephant, buffalo, lion and sable which are not readily available on quota in the region, and therefore fetch premium prices.

Overall the trend has been to leave the industry to market commercial hunting to the best advantage. The strategy adopted has been to offer the potential hunting client a wide range of animals, and this has tended to drive up quotas. This has implications for trophy quality, over hunting, competition and can fuel unethical hunting practices. Furthermore, the potential lucrative nature of sport hunting to governments in the region has been to increase revenue from license fees by either increasing quotas, increasing the number of hunting operations, and or increasing the number of clients. The net result is that the industry has increased in *volume* not in value.

Hunting tenure and allocation systems

The trend has been to offer concessions on 3 – 5 year leases, although in Zambia some concessions are for 10 years. General approach is not to foreclose options on the part of wildlife agencies, but lack of security of tenure also impacts negatively on the industry and reduces willingness of operators to invest in long term management programmes. In the few instances where a state run organisation has assumed the responsibility of directly managing and operating sport hunting operations, the results have been dismal (for example, TAWICO in Tanzania).

The issue of awarding contracts to conduct sport hunting is still problematic to many wildlife authorities. The options available are confined to one of the following:

- Direct negotiation with a prospective investor
- Open Competitive Tender
- Open Auction

Each of these options has advantages and disadvantages, and the approach can be modified to suit particular circumstances (*e.g.* qualified tender or auction). The preferred choice of allocating concessions is primarily through a tender system, even though this probably does not generate the maximum income and is the most difficult to administer.

Tender processes can be simple or involve complex submissions demanding detailed “management plans”, such as those in Botswana. However, rarely are the conditions of successful tenders audited to determine whether they are fulfilling the terms and conditions of the agreements. Furthermore, despite efforts to deal with the issue, tender systems are often viewed with suspicion as they suffer from a lack of transparency. Consequently there are incidences throughout the region where the award of tenders for hunting concessions has been held up as a result of legal challenges in the courts.

With regard to arriving at a value for hunting concessions, there is a tendency for wildlife authorities to split the fee between a *concession fee* and a *trophy fee*. This is meaningless to the potential bidder because it is the *total price* that matters to the outfitter. How he recovers this money to pay the concession fee is of little concern to the lessor, and it has been suggested that the two prices be lumped together. The problem with this suggestion is the question of how to adjust the concession price for inflation or for changes in the quota structure. For these reasons, retaining the split is the most favourable option from a government point of view.

An additional factor here is to avoid placing an emphasis on the trophy fees to generate the bulk of income or insist that the outfitter hunt/sell all the animals on the quota. This only encourages over shooting, and there is no guarantee that animals will be shot or sold thus one is never sure of overall income that will be generated by the concession. It is far better to base the bulk of the income for a concession on the *right to hunt* since this provides the incentive for the outfitter to secure clients rather than remove as many animals as possible.

There are numerous examples of how contracts have been awarded in all the countries where sport hunting is conducted, and in each case there are subtle variations in the methods adopted. In general the following principles should be applied in devising systems for allocating access to hunting concessions, and for determining the price of these concessions:

Competition between operations should be fostered so that realistic market prices are achieved. To achieve this, the wildlife authority should plan to offer fewer concessions than there are operators willing to take them up. In addition, the availability of concessions should be staggered so that a few come up for auction/tender each year or each alternative year.

Systems should be practical and enforceable.

Where possible, systems should be transparent, and avoid any command allocation decisions. This requires that the wildlife authority should declare the terms and conditions of the award system well in advance, and that the award is done in public.

Unfair competition between the State and the private sector should be avoided to the maximum extent possible. For example, the wildlife authority should not attempt to manage its own hunting operation.

Investment in, and development of, the industry should be encouraged. Offering security of tenure and having clear management objectives build into the lease agreement best achieve this.

Revenues from the hunting operations should be maximised, subject to environmental and ecological safeguards. Government should not interfere in the marketing of the safari product. This should be left to market forces. However, government should closely monitor the trends to ensure that the prices are competitive.

The systems for regulating the industry must be appropriate, and conducive to further development of the industry.
It is easier to regulate the industry by minimising the rules and maximising the penalties for contravention.

Barnett, R. and Patterson, C. (2005). **Sport Hunting in the SADC Region: An overview**. TRAFFIC East/Southern Africa. Johannesburg, South Africa
Bartell Bull – **Safari: A Chronicle of Adventure**. Published by Penguin Books, Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England. 1992. 383 pages.
See Jachmann, H. 1998. **Monitoring Illegal Wildlife Use and Law Enforcement in African Savanna Rangelands**. Wildlife Resource Monitoring Unit, ECZ, Lusaka, Zambia.

Wildlife and Poverty Study (2002) prepared by the Livestock and Wildlife Advisory Group in DfID's Rural Livelihoods Department; and

Food for Thought: The Utilization of Wild Meat in Eastern and Southern Africa edited by Rob Barnett. Published by TRAFFIC East/Southern Africa 1997.

Moss, J. 2005. **Further Thoughts on Certification – The Potential for Deregulation**, *In African Indaba e-Newsletter Vol. 3 No. 4* <http://www.africanindaba.co.za>
Parker, Ian 2005. **Thoughts on Certification**. *In African Indaba e-Newsletter Vol. 3 No. 4* <http://www.africanindaba.co.za>
Parker, I. 2004. **HYPERLINK "http://www.iucn.org/themes/ssc/susg/SustainableJuly05/Parker.htm" What I Tell You Three Times is True; Conservation, Ivory, History & Politics**. Brough House, Milton Brodie, Kinloss Moray, Librario Publishing Ltd, UK.
Booth, V. R. 2001. **Analysis of Wildlife (Sport Hunting and Tourism) Markets**. Draft report prepared for WWF SARPO, Harare, Zimbabwe.

Rozemeijer, N and van der Jagt, C. 2000. **Community Based Natural Resource Management in Botswana**. How community based is CBNRM in Botswana?

This Ordinance is currently being reviewed to incorporate the revised policies and strategies currently being developed in Namibia.

Saiwana, L. 1995. **Granting of Safari Hunting Rights in Game Management Areas in Zambia**. In "Tourist Hunting in Tanzania" edited by N. Leader-Williams, J. A. Kayera and G. L. Overton. Planning and Assessment for Wildlife Management Department of Wildlife, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania.

Lamprey, R. 1995. **The Management of Sport Hunting in Tanzania**. SWARA East African Wildlife Society Volume 18 No 2.

Nicholson, B. 1974. **Game Division National Projects: Guidelines for long-term development in selected game areas with suggested management and development plans**. Report to the Game Division, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania.

Baldus, R. D. and Cauldwell, A. E. 2004. **Tourist Hunting and its role in Development of Wildlife Management Areas in Tanzania**. Paper presented at the Sixth International Game Ranching Symposium – Paris July 6th to 9th, 2004

A **Policy and Management Plan for Tourist Hunting (1995)** was developed but have never been formally adopted.

Cauldwell, A. 2004. **Analysis of hunting data of the Selous Game Reserve**. Wildlife Division, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania. 30 pages.

A Conservancy is a group of individually owned properties that have agreed to combine their land holdings to form one large property. Wildlife management is the primary land use of the Conservancy in which sport hunting plays a key role.

ZAWA, 2004. **Procedures and Guidelines for Hunting in Zambia**. Zambian Wildlife Authority, Lusaka, Zambia.

WWF. 1997. **Marketing Wildlife Leases**. Wildlife Management Series prepared by WWF SARPO, Harare. Other booklets in the series include **Managing Safari Hunting** and a **Quota Setting Manual**. This practice has proved to be detrimental to the RDCs following the devaluation of the Zimbabwe dollar and the development of an unofficial "parallel" foreign currency market rate. The

under valued official Zimbabwe dollar exchange rate means that RDC received far less money for their lease, in some case up to 5 times less income, when the official exchange rate is applied.

This overcomes the problem of transparency in the tender process – the evaluators do not know which company is being evaluated.

Booth, V.R. 2004. **Cawston Ranch - Road Strip Count Results - September 2004**. Internal report prepared on behalf of Rosslyn Safaris, Bulawayo.

De la Harpe, D. A. 2004. **2003 Annual Report – Malilangwe Trust**. Internal Publication. The Malilangwe Trust, Chiredzi, Zimbabwe.

Blanc, J.J., Thouless, C.R., Hart, J.A., Dublin, H.T., Douglas-Hamilton, I., Craig, C.G. and Barnes, R.F.W. 2003. **African Elephant Status Report 2002: An update from the African Elephant Database**. IUCN/SSC African Elephant Specialist Group, IUCN, Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, UK vi + 302 pp.

Severre, E.L.M. 1995. **Setting Quotas for Tourist Hunting in Tanzania**. In “Tourist Hunting in Tanzania”. Proceedings of a Workshop held in July 1993. Edited by N. Leader-Williams, J.A. Kayera and G.L. Overton. Planning and Assessment for Wildlife Management, AWF and WWF, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania.

See: **Rights, Resources and Rural Development: Community based natural resource management in Southern Africa**. Edited by Christo Fabricius and Eddie Koch. Earthscan London, 288 pages.

See: **Parks in Transition: Biodiversity, rural development and the bottom line**. Edited by Brain Child. Earthscan London, 267 pages.

Adapted from Booth, V. R., Nangale, G. and Majamba, H. 2000. **Procedures to Enter into Joint Ventures in WMAs**. Position Paper prepared for the Ministry of Environment and Tourism, Wildlife Division, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania. 54 pages.

Booth, V.R., Bond, I. and Khumalo, M. (in preparation). **An Analysis of trophy hunting in Zimbabwe**. WWF Occasional Paper Series, WWF – SARPO, Harare, Zimbabwe.

Child, B. 1988. **Summary of Safari Hunting in Zimbabwe: 1984 – 1986**. Department of National Parks and Wild Life Management Internal Report No 7380. 6 pp.

Child, B. 1984. **An Outline of the Wildlife Resources on Alienated Land**. In “Recreational Hunting on State Land in Zimbabwe: Options for the Future.” Proceedings of a Workshop held at 13th

Ecologist’s Meeting, Hwange Safari Lodge, 12 – 13th June 1984. Edited by D.H.M Cumming and R.B. Martin, Department of National Parks and Wild Life Management, Harare, Zimbabwe. 52pp.

PAWM. 1995. **The Structure of Tanzania’s Tourist Hunting Industry**. In: Leader Williams, N., Kayera, J.A. and Overton, G.L. (Eds), *Tourist Hunting in Tanzania*. Planning and Assessment for Wildlife Management, Department of Wildlife, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania. Pp. 19-25.

A Professional Guides Licence may be equated to a Full Professional Hunter Licence: the difference being that a Guide does not have extensive hunting experience, but is competent in dealing with dangerous game. As a result, a professional hunter may conduct both hunting and walking safaris whereas the professional guide is restricted to walking safaris.

Cauldwell, A. 2004. **Analysis of Hunting Data of the Selous Game Reserve**. GTZ Selous Conservation Programme, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania.

WWF (Harare) in conjunction with the CAMPFIRE association developed a data capture form to capture this information. However, this too has not been as successful with less than 40% of the returns being received.

Final Draft: 26th August 2005

Page PAGE viii

Page PAGE 8

35%

25%

District Councils

Wildlife Division

100%

100%

75%

25%

Trophy handling fees

Game fees

Block fees

Prof. Hunters license

Permit fees

Conservation fees

Observer fees

Treasury

40% retention

Tanzanian Wildlife Protection Fund

No Retention scheme:

50%

Retention scheme:

With Retention scheme:

35%

25%

District Councils

Wildlife Division

50%

50%

25%

25%

100% Type of Local Staff To Be Employed	Estimated Number To Be Employed Trophy handling fees	Estimated Duration of Employment (please specify days, weeks, months)
-----------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Permit fees

Conservation fees

Observer fees

Game fees

Block fees

Prof. hunters license

Treasury

40% retention

Tanzanian Wildlife Protection Fund

Selous Retention Scheme

6. ASSISTANCE TO THE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE WITH FURTHER DEVELOPMENT AND MANAGEMENT OF ITS WILDLIFE RESOURCES:

Please fill Table Four to specify what role your organization might offer to play in developing and managing the wildlife resources.

Table Four. Illustrative support activities towards the management of the wildlife resources.

Illustrative Support Activities	Yes	No	Description of Assistance That Could Be Provided
1. Maintenance of wildlife water points			
2. Development of new wildlife water points			
3. Donations of game for reintroductions			
4. Other			

7. COMMENTS OR SUGGESTIONS BY TENDERING SAFARI COMPANIES:

4. LOCAL STAFF TO BE EMPLOYED:

Please specify in Table two the type and number of local staff your company will hire, the duration of staff to be employed, and estimated salary per month.

Table Two. Staff Employment:

Type of Local Staff To Be Employed	Estimated Number To Be Employed	Estimated Duration of Employment (please specify days, weeks, or months)	Estimated Salary per Time of Employ (days, weeks, months)
Camp Staff			
Skinners			
Trackers			
Other 1.			
2.			
3.			

5. TRAINING OF LOCAL EMPLOYEES:

Please specify Table Three the type of training your organization would be able to provide to local staff employed by your organization or natural resource management staff of the Conservancies. Please note that that the successful concessionaire will be expected to train at least one staff member to a registered Hunting Guide level within three years.

Table Three. Types of training the concessionaire will provide.

Number of Local People to be Trained	Types of Training To Be Provided	Estimated Length of Training	Proposed Training Site

3. PRICES TENDERED FOR REQUESTED QUOTA BY INDIVIDUAL, CATEGORIC SPECIES:

Table One includes the categoric number of animals per year the Concession has on its annual quota. The Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET) has authorized this off take as a rolling, five-year quota that will be subject to annual review by the MET and the Management Committee. Inputs from the Concessionaire will be built into the review process, thereby allowing upward or downward adjustment of the quota based upon the number of animals found in the Concession.

The Concessionaire is required to offer a guaranteed payment for all trophy animals other than roan and sable antelope, bush pigs, and problem animals. In the case of roan and sable antelope, such animals move in and out of the Concession and hunts are opportunistic. Thus, the Concessionaire should make a full market-value offer based upon the successful harvesting of trophy roan and sable antelope. Similarly, the nocturnal habits of bushpigs make successful hunting of these animals difficult. In addition, as the number of Problem Animals cannot be predicted, the Concessionaire will not be required to make a guaranteed payment for the hunting of Problem Elephants and Problem Hippos. Thus, the Concessionaire should only fill out columns three (3) and seven (7) in Table One for roan antelope, sable antelope, bushpigs, Problem Elephants, and Problem Hippos.

The Concessionaire is required to fill out all blank spaces in Table One. Ultimately, the figures derived from the addition of Column Six will entail the Concessionaire’s guaranteed offer for the trophy animal quota (except roan, sable, and bushpig) and the designated quota for non-trophy animals for traditional feasts.

1. BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON TENDERING ORGANIZATION:

Name of Namibian Registered Safari Organization:
Authorized Representative:
Address:
Phone Number:
Fax Number:
Email Address:
Number of Years in Business:
Number of Clients Serviced During 2004 Hunting Season:
Name of Employed Professional Hunter(s):

2. QUOTA CATEGORIES:

The Concession quota contains the following three categories of animals:

Trophy Animals – these are animals to be marketed by the concessionaire as the annual trophy quota. All trophy animals are on offer every year with the exception of roan and sable antelope. One roan antelope is on quota during years 1 and 3, while one sable antelope is on offer during year 2;

Non-Trophy Animals for Traditional Feasts or Own-Use – these are non-trophy animals the concessionaire will be requested to hunt on behalf of the conservancy for scheduled events for the traditional authority or local community. As these animals include elephant and hippo, they have a significant hunting value and the concessionaire is expected to pay a market value for non-trophy animals of these species. However, should a trophy-quality animal be harvested as a non-trophy animal, the concessionaire will be expected to pay the trophy value for such an animal. Trophy elephants will be animals having both tusks weighing forty (40) or more pounds, while hippos will be deemed a trophy if they are fully mature bull hippos; and

- C. **Problem Animals** – These animals include up to four (4) elephants and three (3) hippos. Prior to the hunting of these animals, the Management Committee and Ministry of Environment and Tourism must declare and designate individual animals as a “Problem Animal”. The hunt will be undertaken under the guidance of a Ministry and/or Conservancy official. There will be two categories of “Problem Animals”: a non-trophy quality bull or cow and a trophy quality “Problem Trophy Elephant” or “Problem Trophy Hippo”. A Trophy Quality Elephant will be a bull elephant having both tusks larger than forty (40) pounds in weight, while a trophy quality hippo will be a fully mature bull hippo. Concessionaires are requested to make offers on the removal of the above “Problem Animals” for the Concession.

HUNTING CONCESSION TENDER FORM

2005-2007 Hunting seasons, with an option for the 2008-2009 seasons

It is preferable that this form be hand delivered in a sealed envelope, addressed to the Chairman of the Management Committee, care of the WWF/LIFE Programme Office, 5th Floor Kenya House, Robert Mugabe Avenue, Windhoek. However, if it is not possible for this form to be hand delivered, then it may be faxed to the WWF/LIFE Office at 061-239799 **or** emailed to: sherlin@wwflife.org All tender information will be kept confidential during the tender process.

STEP 1: Selected community member’s workshop: Involving selected members of conservancy (board + other individuals), MET, NGO and other involved stake holders. Focus point of workshop:

Discussed different utilization options with analysis’s of every available option.
Do a feasibility of trophy hunting in specific communal conservancy (just main issue).
Give background of trophy hunting in Namibia and present situation.
Discuss value of game species occurring in the conservancy and compare to other areas as well as commercial farming areas.
Discuss different approaches in awarding concession contract.
Agree on specific options and plans on when, and how to proceed.

Agree on quota to request from MET.

STEP 2: Negotiation with MET

Provide management plans and monitoring statistic and motivate request for trophy hunting quota (be realistic).

Request for three to five year running concession quota

STEP 3: Feedback to community. Give feedback to community through appropriated meetings on process to be followed, approved quota from MET and the way forward.

STEP 4: Draft letter of invitation to various Professional Hunters/Safari companies.

STEP 5: Draft a Tender document including the following information (remember this document may be also used as a legal document but be as precise as possible).

STEP 6: Review draft tender document and draft contract.

STEP 7: Legal opinion on draft contract and tender document.

STEP 8: Distribution of Tender document.

STEP 9: Closure and receiving interested tender forms. Summarise tenders on Evaluation Form

Tender Evaluation Form (Only a guide and may be add to).

Name of PH/Company Price offered for quota A Price offered for additional animals No of jobs to be created Training opportunities Assistance to be provide Other benefits (to be converted to N\$/yr) PH other hunting areas PH years of operation Remarks

STEP 10: Listing of candidates as per offers.

STEP 11: Workshop with management committee

Explain the evaluation form

Review the applications explain the offers in detail.

Short list the tenders with the committee as per evaluation form.

Management committee to rate the short listed candidates at their own terms.

Arrange for possible date suitable for the interview.

STEP 12: Letters to all PH/companies who tender.

STEP 13: Arrange for pre-interview workshop with conservancy committee (as close as possible to interview dates).

STEP 14: Interviews with short listed candidates.

STEP 15: Selecting a partner.

STEP 16: Negotiations to behold where technological is available (try to arrange for negotiations to take place in towns but away from PH/companies premises)

Management committee selects nominated members to negotiate on behalf of the conservancy.

Members must act reasonable and must listen to their possible partner but must negotiate were applicable.

Draft all agreed comments and points on draft document.

Redraft contract and if possible obtain legal advice prior to signing such contract.

TROPHY FEES

SAFARI CLUB INTERNATIONAL Ethics and Code of Conduct Committee

501 2nd Street, N.E., Washington D.C., 20002
phone: + (202) 543-8733; fax: + (202) 543-1205
e-mail: safari@sci-dc.org

February 26, 2003

Mr.

Via E-mail

Dear Mr:

You have contacted the offices of Safari Club International in order to file a complaint with the Committee on Ethics and Code of Conduct. To begin the process, we will need the enclosed Complaint Form filled out completely. After you have completed the form, please return it to the address shown above, along with your supporting materials.

Please note that the SCI Bylaws require that a Complaint Form must be signed and sworn to in the presence of a Notary Public (or in other countries, a similar office empowered to administer oaths and acknowledge signatures on documents). If the Complaint Form is not signed and notarized, the Bylaws do not allow the Committee to accept or otherwise consider the complaint.

Please understand that the party against whom you are complaining will be contacted and will be given an opportunity to respond. That party will be provided with a copy of the Complaint Form and the supporting materials that you submit with the form. The Complaint Form, the response, and all supporting materials will be submitted to an investigating team comprised of two members of the Ethics and Code of Conduct Committee. You will receive a copy of the Response Form and any accompanying materials provided by the Respondent and you may be contacted by the investigating team for further information. Every effort will be made to complete the investigation and resolve the same within 180 days. However, we cannot promise or guarantee how long it will take to complete the investigation.

Sincerely,

Counsel, Ethics and Code of Conduct Committee

Enclosures: Excerpts from SCI Bylaws, Rules of Procedure, Complaint Form

EMBED Word.Picture.8

**9, Glenara Avenue North
Highlands
Harare
Zimbabwe**

**Phone/Fax: +263 4 497851
Cell (local): +263 (0)91 240 998
Cell (International): +27 (0)83 630 3602
Email: swallow1@mweb.co.zw**

WILDLIFE AGENCY

SAFARI OUTFITTER/LAND OWNER

HUNTING CLIENT

DAILY RATE