

AFRICAN INDABA

Volume 2, Issue No 1

e-Newsletter

January 2004

Dedicated to the People and Wildlife of Africa

1 Editorial

Dear Reader,

The first year of African Indaba has passed and the echoes from around the globe have confirmed that our e-newsletter really found a niche in the hunting and conservation related publications. With the assistance of Andreas Jarisch from the HuntingFinder team we are now also able to share our news with the global internet community. The current and all previous issues of African Indaba can be downloaded from the internet (see page 7 for details). I would like to thank Andreas here specifically for the generosity to host and maintain the [African Indaba website](#) free of charge.

The last issue of **African Indaba** – in particular the various articles about the African lion and its status - brought a variety of responses. I was particularly glad that Prof. David Macdonald and one of his co-workers, Dr. Graham Hemson, as well as Dr Laurence Frank and Dr. Craig Packer found time to respond as well as a number of their colleagues from the African Lion Working Group. Let us hope that this signals the start of a broad based and open minded exchange of information and constructive dialogue. African Indaba will do its best to foster such interaction. We will report about the issue again in the near future.

During November last year I was privileged to participate at the annual general meeting of the [Professional Hunters' Association of South Africa](#) and at the meeting of the regional professional hunters' associations immediately thereafter. The message there was loud and clear – as PHASA's president, Dieter Ochsenbein, said in his annual report "... to take a stand against unethical hunting practices like the canned shooting of animals and ... to make the public aware of the benefits of hunting to wildlife and the nation". Neither he nor I had by then seen the infamous lion video discussed on page 10 – but incidents like that reinforce us to continue with the lobbying efforts to outlaw any of these practices, be it lion or any other game animal. The proponents of unsavoury practices like canned shooting use all kind of distorted arguments to justify their activity. The most perverse ones I have heard are "that canned shooting protects the wild specimens from the hunters' bullets and is therefore conservation relevant" and that "chasing a canned lion in a small enclosure levels the playing field between shooter and lion". Let's face the truth please – for the lion breeders and their associates canned lion shooting is an unsavoury, but economically attractive activity with high profit margins. It has nothing to do with conservation and with hunting.

Quite the contrary, it is water on the mills of people like Saliem Fakir, who depict the hunting and the hunter as bloodthirsty anachronism (see article on page 9).

On a positive note, hunters made major donations to the

WWF-SA supported [Southern African Wildlife College](#) near Orpen (Kruger National Park). Rand 100,000 each were donated by the African Chapter and PHASA to that institution and Gray Thornton of [Dallas Safari Club \(DSC\)](#) brought a donation of US\$ 5,000 to the party. At the same time the College requested and received 400 books and posters "The Conservation Game – Saving Africa's Biodiversity" for use in their curriculum activities and to spread the message of responsible sustainable use of natural resources amongst the wildlife managers of the African continent. Books and posters were sponsored by the African Chapter. If you are interested in this material, contact **African Indaba** by [email](#).

Africa is the preferred hunting destination for hunters around the world. US-American hunters are by far the most numerous amongst all visiting hunters. Consequently, the marketing efforts of African professional hunters center on the North American market. Safari operators from all over Africa donate a large number of safaris to the various conventions and meetings in order to attract clients. Taking these facts into account it seems to be logic that a substantial part of the money earned through these donations should be spent for conservation in Africa. The article on page 5 analyzes this year's donation to the [SCI](#) Reno Convention.

The situation in Zimbabwe does not need any comment from my side – the international media are full with horror stories of what happens to the people and the wildlife of this beautiful country. The hunter who considers hunting in Zimbabwe should be very careful when selecting the safari operator and professional hunter. There are a number of operators who take chances and use the unstable conditions to make a quick killing – do not fall into their trap and check any offer carefully! There are many decent and legally operating Zimbabwean hunting outfitters around, and if you want to hunt in Zimbabwe, it is your duty to look for them!

All the best for 2004!

Gerhard R Damm, Editor

INSIDE THIS ISSUE

1. Editorial
2. African Wildlife: Must it be subsidized? (Dr. Rolf Baldus)
3. Wildlife as a natural resource (IGF)
4. Africa's contribution to convention auctions (G Damm)
5. Namibian Ministry defends hunter
6. News from Africa
7. A reply to an anti-hunter (G Damm)
8. Lion charge video
9. USF&W Draft Policy - Endangered Species Act
10. AWF in DR Congo (AWF)
11. Selous Conservation Program (GTZ)

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

2 African Wildlife: Must it be subsidized?

A contribution to the discussion on sustainable financing of protected areas

By Rolf D. Baldus

Conclusion

Conservation of biodiversity in Africa is desirable for a variety of ecological, economic and other reasons. Whereas economics do not necessarily rank top of the list, the neglect thereof will inevitably lead to the failure of achieving conservation objectives. If wildlife and protected areas do not contribute to poverty reduction but instead limit available resources which otherwise could be used to alleviate poverty, then their conservation has no political future. They will not be able to compete with other forms of land use. Sustainable financing should mainly be self-generated, as wildlife is a productive renewable resource. Permanent subsidies by outside sources should remain the option only in well-justified individual cases when all other income-generating possibilities have been exhausted.

Finance as Core Conservation Problem

The upkeep of national parks, game reserves and similar protected wildlife areas goes hand in hand with a considerable effort. Depending on the objectives for protecting an area, the costs of developing infrastructure and keeping a reasonable management regime average between 50 and 300†US-\$ per sq km annually. In small protected areas the costs per unit area can even be much higher¹. Considering the total size of areas under protection in Africa the efforts of upkeep add up to enormous sums, which are usually neither covered by income nor, because of other priorities, by public budgets. Some countries in Africa have placed 10 to 25% of their land surface (in Tanzania about 150 000 sq km) under strict protection. The positive economic impact of such areas on the economy are significant in countries such as Tanzania and South Africa, but low in others, which have little tourism such as Mozambique and Uganda.

Empirical studies prove a distinct correlation between financial investment and successful protection. On the other hand practical experience shows that inefficient and corrupt administrations can also easily consume high financial inputs and investment without tangible results. It is not necessarily true that a lot of money helps a lot! Adequate financing is therefore a prerequisite but not in itself sufficient. It should also not be forgotten that finance is only "a" and not "the" core conservation problem as it is so often assumed to be but seldom queried. In many practical cases much more could be achieved with the available finance if only the money was spent more wisely and if the management was more efficient.

Nevertheless in reality many protected areas in Africa are seriously under-funded and cannot meet their goals. Surveys show that only a few are raising income coming even close to cover expenditure. Most aid projects have not managed to change this. Presently there seems to be a general consensus that there is little hope that Africa's wildlife protected areas will ever be self-supporting.

However, there are examples to the contrary. For example, the Selous Game Reserve in Tanzania generates ca. 3.9 Mio. US-\$ per annum from tourist hunting (92%) and photographic tourism (8%) and is allowed to retain half of this amount to sustain its management². This is sustainable finance in the true sense of the word. Another example is the Tanzanian National Parks system

(TANAPA) where four profit-generating parks subsidize nine loss making ones.

In many countries, significant wildlife populations (about half within Tanzania) continue to exist outside protected areas. Basic protection of this wildlife by the respective authorities entails further expenditure over and above that of the protected areas.

Unfortunately the reality of most countries is that these means are lacking, and effective anti-poaching outside protected areas is even less of a reality than within. Commercial poaching ("bushmeat") is therefore a common phenomenon throughout Africa, as empirical studies prove³.

"Use It or Lose It"?

Just as development cooperation followed the principle of "help for self-help", so too was it undisputable to economists that conservation of wildlife and other natural resources should also orientate itself on basic economic principles. Wildlife and protected areas can be economically used and consequently have the potential to generate income in a sustainable manner which can finance their upkeep and contribute at the same time to the welfare of people, in particular of the rural dwellers sharing the same areas. Income, so the doctrine goes, was to cover expenditure as much as possible. Natural resources, which generate income, have a higher chance of being conserved by people, perpetually striving to meet their needs, than those resources, which solely entail costs. Despite simplifying it a bit too much, the slogan "use it or lose it" sums it up nicely.

Of course such a principle cannot be applied in absolute terms. It is not valid in each and every case. Not every protected area, not every type of biodiversity, can be utilized or is able to finance itself.

As a general rule protection and utilization are not fundamental contradictions. The World Conservation Union (IUCN) defines "conservation" to mean both the protection and sustainable use of natural resources including wildlife.

International conventions and declarations, such as the Convention on Biological Diversity, give nations the right to utilize their natural resources including wildlife in all consumptive and non-consumptive forms. At its 2000 World Congress in Amman, IUCN reconfirmed the legitimacy of consumptive use of wild living resources⁴.

Sustainable use options for game are many and varied. These include photo tourism, hunting, game ranching, meat production, use of by-products and live capture.

Empirical experience shows that a combination of different forms of utilization usually renders the highest income. In some instances environmentally friendly game utilization can bring equal or even greater revenues per unit area than other land use options, e.g. agriculture. It is possible to design all these forms of use in an environmentally friendly or - in the case of over-utilization - an unsustainable manner. Overshooting of a hunting quota is as unsustainable as is too high a visitor pressure in a national park. And while in Southern Africa capture and resettlement of large mammals make up a large industry which has contributed to higher wildlife numbers on the land, live capture in other parts of Sub-Saharan Africa tends to take place in the murky realms of illegality, animal abuse and over-use.

Where organized properly, however, the so-called consumptive use of game has contributed to the protection of species and habitats and increase of wildlife numbers. In this way, endangered or near-extinct species have been saved through a combination of

Continued on Page 4

3 Wildlife as natural resource

6th International Wildlife Ranching Symposium
Paris, France 6th to 9th July 2004

This International Wildlife Ranching Symposium organized by the [International Foundation for the Conservation of Wildlife](#) (IGF) has the theme "Wildlife as a Natural Resource". It follows on symposia held in 2001 on "Sustainable utilization: conservation in practice" (Pretoria, RSA), 1999 on "Game conservation and sustainability" (Toronto, Canada), 1992 on "Wildlife ranching: a celebration of diversity" (Pretoria, RSA), 1990 on "Wildlife production: conservation and sustainable development" (Edmonton, Canada) and the first symposium in 1988 (Las Cruces, Mexico).

The 2004 Paris Symposium is the first one ever organized in France or indeed in Europe and will be held at the prestigious and historical Grand Amphithéâtre of the National Museum of Natural History in the compounds of the Jardin des Plantes, in the heart of Paris. The Jardin des Plantes stretching along the banks of the river Seine and offers the proximity of many places of interest to the participants: e.g. the oldest zoological gardens in the world, the Grande Galerie de l'Evolution, and other museums.

The symposium – with French and English as the working languages - will provide a forum to interact and exchange information and ideas on all aspects of wildlife conservation as a tool for sustainable development, including:

- Sustainable use of wildlife re-evaluated as a tool for conservation of biodiversity
- Wildlife management in harmony with rural development
- Consumptive use and non-consumptive use of wildlife
- Wildlife ranching under temperate, arctic and tropical conditions
- Multispecies and multifunctional wildlife ranching
- Monospecific wildlife farming including deer, crocodile, ostrich, grasscutter
- New technologies for the sustainable use of wildlife
- New approaches for involving local communities including CBNRM, conservancies
- Wildlife as food including the bushmeat issues
- Wildlife products including marketing, processing, controlling
- Wildlife/Human conflicts including disease transmission, crop damages, livestock predation
- Legal issues in the field of sustainable use of wildlife including challenges in land use policy

10 years after the global survey of wildlife management in Africa carried out by the International Foundation for the Conservation of Wildlife (IGF) on behalf of the European Union, several questions remain to be answered:

- How can wildlife succeed in maintaining its existence within our world in rapid modernization?
- How is the observed erosion of biodiversity definitely, directly and positively correlated to the development of human population and activity?
- How, in the forthcoming future, we can keep some "wild" spaces for our wildlife on our transformed planet?

Too many indicators provide evidence that wildlife is struggling to survive despite increased awareness and multiple measures to cope with negative trends of global conservation. The emerging concept of sustainable development has brought hope to reconcile conservation and development. One of the most obvi-

ous solutions lies in the sustainable use of renewable natural resources. Wildlife is indeed one of these. Paradoxically, the use of renewable resources such as wildlife or timber is more controversial than the use of non-renewable natural resources such as oil or fossil water. One of the reasons for this may lie in a higher perceived value of the latter in industrialized societies. Maybe it is time to reconsider these relative perceptions and to upgrade the value of living beings such as wild fauna and flora.

The International Wildlife Ranching Symposium (IWRS) has been trying now for 15 years to gather the people who care about upgrading the value of wildlife throughout the world. As a matter of fact, IWRS is a unique forum to exchange the practical experiences of stakeholders relying on wildlife for their livelihood in developing and industrialized societies. Wild animal productions do not always receive the full recognition that the domestic animal productions have, despite major assets and advantages: local cultural acceptance, ecological balance, contribution of civil society to the maintenance of biodiversity, diversification of the rural economies, integration of the wild and transformed sides of the landscape, valorisation of the wildlife resources, reduced reliance of the society on intensive productions with detrimental impact on environment, and foreign-imposed inequitable terms of trade, etc.

The 6th session of IWRS should bring significant added value to both conservation of wildlife and development for human societies. The organizers cordially welcome and invite the participation of a wide audience of wildlifera from around the world, including: government representatives, university members and students, veterinary school representatives, members of zoological/wildlife/animal production associations, biodiversity conservation experts, hunters and conservationists, game ranchers/ranch managers, private and public landowners, NGO representatives, geneticists, ecologists, commercial developers, providers of products and services.

Organizers

The [International Foundation for the Conservation of Wildlife](#) is a non-profit charitable organization, created in Paris in 1977. The goal of the Foundation is to conserve and develop wildlife in the context of globalization and growing economies. Its strategy is based on collaboration with local partners and international contributors for conducting wildlife-related field projects and scientific studies around the world, with a particular focus on developing countries. The sustainable use of wild flora and fauna is considered as a privileged way for reconciling Conservation and Development and leading to sustainable development. The international steering committee includes well-known names Lyle A. Renecker, Canada, Raul Valdez, USA, John Fowler, USA, Josef von Kerckerinck, USA, Ken Drew, New Zealand, David Hopcraft, Kenya, Andrew Conroy, South Africa, Keith Woodford, Australia and Wouter van Hoven, South Africa.

Call for Papers

Contributions to the Symposium can either take the form of oral presentations or poster presentations: Oral presentations will be presented in French or English. Time allocated for presentation is 15 minutes. Data projectors and slide projectors will be available. Poster presentations can be presented in either French or English. Authors will have to submit their proposal in digital format by sending as an e-mail attachment or sending a diskette with the text of the proposal in Word format. The contribution proposals will be reviewed by the Scientific Committee. Authors will be advised

Continued on Page 8

Continued from Page 2

2 African Wildlife: Must it be subsidized?

protection and utilization. Crocodiles and white rhinos are examples of species brought back from the brink of extinction by means of pragmatic conservation.

Controlled tourist hunting is an especially revenue-rich form of utilization, which impacts relatively little on the environment. For emotional and ideological reasons, however, hunting is often excluded as an option for income generation. Opponents of utilization have joined together in large and financially powerful groups that are able to exert wide public and political influence.

In systems in which utilization is not permitted, wildlife represents costs only to the landowner and not any income. Those however who inflict only costs on the proprietor or user of land and yet deny them the benefits are with certainty contributing to the extinction of wildlife.

By putting a value on a resource, an incentive is created to protect it in order to be able to reap benefits in the long-term. In any case the ban on use has always been fictional in Africa as it has not been able to halt the on-going massive illegal utilization ("bushmeat", rhino horn and ivory). Empirical data from countries with hunting bans show that these have by no means contributed to the protection of wildlife. On the other hand in Southern Africa the fact that game has been given a value has led to environmentally friendly game ranching in many areas.

A precondition for the long-term success of any system of utilization is that a considerable share of the income is reinvested into protection and management and further that the landowner can profit from the game on the land.

Protected areas go hand in hand with considerable opportunity costs, i.e. income foregone by not using the area otherwise. These opportunity costs have, on the basis of agricultural revenues foregone, been estimated for example for the Ugandan National Parks to be 110 Mio. US-\$⁵. This is an important political argument to revise the status of protected areas. In many places it has been shown that sensible "wildlife management" can however compete with agriculture and livestock.

How to Reduce the Deficits

In principle the system "use it or lose it" has had a high degree of success. Nevertheless the income to be realized in many areas does not suffice to protect wildlife and its habitats and to additionally generate revenues for landowners and the state.

As was mentioned earlier, it is also important to take into account that some species or biospheres are so rare, endangered or sensitive that they are not suitable for utilization. In such cases it is inevitable that ways be sought to close the financial gap between income and expenditure. Once again, the aspect of cost should be considered first. More often than not, one should start by improving financial planning and spending and by lowering expenditure. Under a strict financial management regime, less external finance is needed to close the deficit. The same applies to spending levels. If funds are scarce, not everything that might be desirable in such fields as research, monitoring or infrastructure should be financed. Economic investment has to be subjected to cost-benefit considerations.

"Can we afford tourism?" asked the late Richard Bell in relation to the South Luangwa National Park when I met him there in 1986⁶. Sometimes the entire revenue from tourism is not sufficient to finance a fraction of the road network put in by a donor for the use of the tourists.

This may all sound blatantly obvious however there are many real life examples where such simple principles have been ignored. Many governmental and parastatal structures assigned with the task of managing protected areas are ineffective. They tend to be overstaffed, lacking in transparency, and are constrained in decision making by excessive bureaucracy. Reforms are needed that, as is well-known, are hard to realize. It may make sense to privatize such structures totally or in part.

State bureaucracies are burdened with many tasks over and above their capabilities that would be best left to the private sector. It is a well-known fact that governmental systems and hospitality go together like fire and ice. Nevertheless, in many protected areas governments try to run the hotels and similar economic establishments. Often, these responsibilities are not relinquished, simply to hold on to sources of money and wages.

This was the situation in the South African parks, where the Department managed hotels, campsites, shops etc. Often figures were in the red, but no one was aware of the actual balance due to deficient accounting. When the lush subsidies were cut drastically after 1994, hundreds of employees had to be made redundant and privatization could no longer be avoided.

In many cases it would make sense to privatize entire protected areas. Biodiversity protection need not be compromised if a park, having been badly managed by the state and running at a loss, is managed by the private sector with the intention of earning money.

Plundering of the parks by the private sector, as is done frequently by public sector staff, can be prevented if management plans, long-term lease agreements and regular eco-audits are put in place. If the management and protection of wildlife on communal and private lands is entrusted into the hands of those who own or hold the land, i.e. the communities and the landowners, then this would also lead to a reduction of management costs for governmental institutions.

In this way a "Community based Conservation Program" can not only increase the conservation status of such areas but can also reduce public spending. State departments are generally reluctant to privatize, as they would be deprived of sources of revenue and lose influence and power. They much prefer external financing schemes, which after all permit deficits to be covered with few strings attached. There is also minimum pressure to conform, thus allowing those responsible to continue as before.

Continued on Page 6

African Indaba eNewsletter

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

WEB: www.africanindaba.netfirms.com

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

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

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

4 Africa's contribution to convention auctions

By Gerhard R Damm

African Indaba has again analyzed the hunting related donations for the SCI Annual Convention 2004 in Reno. The result looks remarkably similar to last year's analysis, also published in **African Indaba**. Of all the continents, Africa again comes out on top with donation for hunting safaris. Just under one million US dollars worth in donations originate from African outfitters and professional hunters – 32.22% of all hunt donations. South Africa – with its flourishing hunting industry - contributes the lion's share with US\$ 544,062 (2003: US\$ 437,000), way ahead of Tanzania with US\$ 123,244 (2003: US\$ 134,000). Zimbabwe's donation value reflects the political turmoil of the country and the dire economic stress the Zimbabwean outfitters are suffering - the donation value for this country dropped from a low US\$ 63,000 in 2003 to one single donation valued at US\$ 15,000!

Comparing that with last year's figures, the donation value for hunts in the United States increased from US\$ 449,000 to US\$ 637,000; Canadian outfitters reduced their donation value slightly from US\$ 286,000 to US\$ 261,000; Asia and Pacific went from US\$ 276,000 to US\$ 451,000; South America from US\$ 396,000 to US\$ 421,000 and Africa recorded a slight increase from US\$ 948,000 to US\$ 958,000 (despite of the drop in Zimbabwe). Worldwide SCI's 2003 donation valuation for hunts of US\$ 2.4 million increased to just under US\$ 3.0 million in 2004 (all figures of this analysis are based on lists and donor valuations in as published in SCI Safari Times, November 2003):

Donations Africa		Donations per Continent		
Country	US\$	Continent/Country	US\$	%
RSA	\$544,062	USA	\$637,588	21.45%
Mozambique	\$22,280	Canada	\$261,357	8.79%
Zambia	\$22,700	Argentina	\$291,845	9.79%
Zimbabwe	\$15,500	Rest South America	\$130,362	4.39%
Tanzania	\$123,244	Europe	\$243,015	8.17%
Namibia	\$60,580	Asia and Oceania	\$451,460	15.19%
Ethiopia	\$28,350	Africa	\$957,916	32.22%
Botswana	\$77,600	Total	\$2,973,543	100.00%
		CAR	\$13,000	
		Cameroon	\$50,600	
		Total Africa	\$957,916	

We want to point out again that African safari operators also donate hunts and safaris of substantial value to Dallas Safari Club, Houston Safari Club, even to the Foundation of North American Wild Sheep – and most importantly to a great number of individual SCI chapters for fundraising purposes. In total, the African donation value for all these organizations, inclusive of SCI, will certainly surpass the 2.5 million dollar mark in 2004. This underlines again the importance of the African continent for the budgets of all these organizations.

One has to bear in mind, however, that a certain percentage of the overall auction results goes back to the donating company (depending on the donation policy of the respective organization; some donors also make a 100 percent donation) and that the

actual auction results often do not meet the estimated valuation on which this analysis was based.

Besides making a mere analysis, **African Indaba** however also wants to comment on these donations: We feel that the generosity of Africa's professional hunters and safari outfitters is not reflected adequately in "what Africa gets back". The funds which are ploughed back into African conservation projects, African hunting advocacy and African PR-work stand in no relation to the income generated through those donations, although exceptions can be found. Apart from that, we feel that there is a need to apply a stricter reserve price policy on auctioned safaris in order to avoid selling valuable safaris at below-cost-prices and thereby damaging the buyer/seller relations to the detriment of the donor.

Admittedly – the donors donate for a business reason; they want to get PR exposure with the convention participants and in some cases they want to collect "bonus" points for better booth placement. These donors, however, also represent the conservation efforts of the African hunting community – and therefore they can rightfully expect that dollars raised with their donation go back to Africa into hunting and conservation related projects. We consider it not very appropriate that the economically poorest continent subsidizes conservation and advocacy efforts in North America. It should be rather the other way round – but **African Indaba** would be rather happy, if we could manage to convince our friends in the United States that Africa is indeed in dire need of more (and properly coordinated) conservation projects where international hunting organizations cooperate with research scientists, wildlife managers and rural communities..

That would not only increase public awareness in Africa of hunters working pro-actively for conservation, but more importantly it would open many additional doors in the scientific community as well as in African government circles. The end result would be more and better hunting opportunities for the worldwide hunting community in Africa and an enhanced conservation of our African natural resources.

HUNTING ASSOCIATIONS IN AFRICA

- Confederation of Hunting Associations of SA (CHASA)**
PO Box 184, Bethal 2310, RSA, phone: 017-647-5882, fax: 017-647-4057
- Professional Hunters' Association of South Africa (PHASA)**, PO Box 10264, Centurion 0046, RSA, p 012-663-2417, fax 012-663-7212, phasa@pixie.co.za, www.professionalhunters.co.za
- Eastern Cape Game Management Association (ECGMA)**, POB 1344, Uitenhage 6230, RSA, phone & fax: 041-922-7618, ecgma@global.co.za, www.ecgma.co.za
- African Professional Hunters' Association (APHA)**, PO Box 24919, Nairobi, Kenya, phone 254-2-891809, fax 254-2-890818, ravn@swiftkenya.com
- Botswana Wildlife Management Association (BWMA)**, Private Bag 095, Maun. Botswana, phone 267-686 2673, fax 267-66-2671, trophy@info.bw
- Nambian Professional Hunter's Association (NAPHA)**, PO Box 11291 Windhoek, Namibia, p 264-61-234455, fax 264-61-222567, napha@natron.net, www.natron.net/napha
- Zimbabwe Professional Hunters and Guides Association (ZPHGA)**, P.O. Box 7240, Harare, Zimbabwe, 263-4-708878/9, fax 263-4-794015, pangeti@zct.co.zw, keiray@zol.co.zw
- Tanzania Professional Hunters' Association (TZPHA)**
PO Box 3483, Dar Es Salaam, Tanzania, phone 255-22-2666-6174, fax 255-22-2667-692, tzpha@hotmail.com
- Professional Hunters' Association of Zambia (PHAZ)**
Postnet 184, Pte. Bag E835, Lusaka, Zambia, phone 260-1-251-946, fax 260-1-251-946, suedale@zamnet.zm

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

Continued from Page 4

2 African Wildlife: Must it be subsidized?

Creative Financing to Stimulate without Oppressing Efforts

The question whether wildlife "can pay its way" has often been raised. It probably cannot be answered better than Eltringham did when he asserted "... that under certain conditions, wildlife can make a substantial contribution to its own conservation but there are circumstances in which it cannot..."⁷.

The following wildlife areas should be self-supporting under normal circumstances:

- National Parks with attractive wildlife populations suitable for mass tourism and located in politically stable countries.
- Small prime wildlife protected areas in private hands suitable for high price/low volume tourism.
- Relatively small areas offering a special attraction which is in high demand
- Well-managed hunting areas.

Wildlife outside protected areas can equally be sustained, if the population pressure is not too high, some amount of proper control is in place, and rural communities are allowed to use their wildlife in a regulated system and on a sustainable basis for their own benefit.

It has to be accepted that many other wildlife-protected areas need some kind of permanent outside subsidies. The hope to finance them with so-called "eco-tourism" has turned out to be an illusion for a number of reasons.

What form this external funding should take is not a subject of this paper. Different types of innovative conservation funding are presently being developed⁸. The important fact is that such outside funding should only complement and not substitute efforts of self-reliance and that the above-mentioned economic principles are adhered to.

Conservation finance must be tied to achievement. It must not bankrupt the non-performers. Otherwise they get rewarded and the performers are punished. This is easy to postulate, but difficult to secure in practice. Whether we like it or not, proper controls by those who provide the funds and therefore have the foremost interest that they are put to proper use, are indispensable. It is presently a trend, mostly borne by frustration over the lack of success of classical project aid, to provide assistance increasingly in the form of budget finance and basket funding.

This might be regarded as modern and politically correct by some however, it is difficult to see how such systems, with their limited and indirect control, could work better. After all lack of funds is not the main conservation bottleneck, but rather organizational and management deficits and bad governance.

There is another issue that should be mentioned here, as it is only a minority of conservationists who seem to be aware of it: Multiple use approaches normally lead to higher revenues from wildlife and protected areas. Without controlled hunting it will not be possible in most cases to earn sufficient revenues for conservation. This does not imply that prime National Parks should be turned into hunting reserves. But in most countries there are enough buffer zones and other areas, many of them neglected, which are suitable. In some cases, it is advisable to protect an area as a hunting reserve instead of a National Park.

Even in situations where wildlife populations are relatively depleted, some careful use is possible and wildlife populations will

recover fast as long as the habitat is still available for wildlife and some degree of protection against illegal exploitation is put in place with the money earned from hunting.

The hunting areas can be remote. They do not have to be scenic, and they do not necessarily need to have spectacular and abundant wildlife populations. Also, management and infrastructure needs are less than in sophisticated tourist areas. Hunting carried out in this way, if it is well controlled and the off-takes are within sustainable limits, can have more of ecotourism character than many of the photographic ventures⁹.

In Germany, a densely populated country, wildlife is used and hunted in a regulated system. Revenues go to the landowners. Every year around 1.4 million large mammals, such as roe deer and wild pigs, are shot by the hunters who pay dearly for this privilege. A hunting ban would result in annual economic losses of around 500 million US-\$ and would lead to additional public spending in the range of several hundred million US-\$. Despite being relatively wealthy, Germany has decided against bearing these losses and costs. Why then should the German tax payer via development aid subsidize wildlife in those African countries where the Government has taken the deliberate decision to ban hunting and sacrifice the revenue, although wildlife numbers allow sustainable use and land owners even demand it?

It is difficult to understand why some countries, protected areas or projects complain that they are unable to finance the upkeep of their wildlife, and at the same time do not permit sustainable hunting. But sometimes one has the impression that some wildlife lovers believe in a dogma that "wildlife should not pay its way", even if it can.

Finance Funds

Recently Finance Funds of different design are increasingly been looked upon as the panacea for wildlife conservation¹⁰. This form of long-term subsidization is often called "sustainable finance" - an expression that is a contradiction in itself. The use of "sustainable" in the context of subvention is about as appropriate as its use in reference to food aid¹¹.

Funds can serve as innovative financing mechanisms for conservation in certain situations. Nevertheless the major deficiencies and dangers of subsidies remain valid. They keep out-dated and inefficient structures alive, prevent incentives for change and pressures to perform, and they lead to an uneconomic allocation of resources. Subsidies thereby contribute to inefficiency and prevent innovation. Apart from the well-known problems of spending money, the conservation agencies are now in addition burdened with fund management. Costs, difficulties and risks of such portfolios frequently tend to be underestimated. Some conservation funds have already lost part of their capital.

For all involved such funds are, however, a simple and welcome solution. First, the conservation agencies gain access to finances without any great efforts on their behalf, with little outside control and obligations to be met in return. As a rule they are neither forced to function effectively nor are they disciplined about expenditure. The control mechanisms are hardly constraining and

Continued on Page 8

5 Namibian Ministry defends hunter

The Ministry of Environment and Tourism has come to the defense of a professional hunter who killed a collared desert elephant during a trophy hunt in the Grootberg area in late 2003. Tensions were running high among tour operators and researchers when unconfirmed reports circulated that the friendly bull elephant, named Doetab, had been shot. The "elephant with a personality", believed to have been almost 50 years old, delighted many tourists to the area over the years.

Director for Parks and Wildlife Management, Ben Beytell, says the crux of the incident lay in the collar Doetab wore, which the hunter explained to officials was apparently not visible when the animal was approached. "They [professional hunters] will definitely not shoot a collared elephant deliberately. It is unfortunate. It was a mistake," Beytell said. "The fact that he [the hunter] came immediately to explain indicates that he is very sorry about that. We've never had any problems with him [the hunter]".

Doetab, a Damara-Nama name meaning "he who wanders afar", was collared three years ago for research purposes, but there is no law prohibiting hunters from targeting these animals. Beytell said that Doetab's collar was of a similar colour and appearance to the elephant's hide and probably could not have been easily discerned. The elephant had been seen at a distance in the #Khoadi //Hoas Conservancy and approached from behind. Although one of his tusks was damaged, the other still appeared in good condition. The elephant was shot in the chest by the tourist, with the hunter delivering the coup de grace. The jumbo was shot on the conservancy's concession, which has been given permission by the Ministry to hunt one elephant in 2003.

"We ascertain that game numbers are sufficient before issuing a concession. There are then very detailed regulations pertaining to trophy hunting. I'm confident that professional hunters for big game will not jeopardize their status [by killing an animal improperly]". Beytell confirmed that a community game guard accompanied the hunt. According to the guard's statement, he had been unaware of the special regard attached to this elephant.

Source: The Namibian, Windhoek

IMPORTANT

New African Indaba Website

We gratefully acknowledge the assistance of Andreas Jarisch from the [HuntingFinder](#) Team in making the current and previous issues of **African Indaba** available for a wide public on the Internet.

You can now access the current issue of **African Indaba** under <http://www.africanindaba.netfirms.com/>.

Individual previous issues are also available. Check for the recently published yearbook **The Best from African Indaba 2003** with a selection of important articles from Volume 1 #1-6. This yearbook can be downloaded at <http://www.africanindaba-2003.netfirms.com/#1>

6 News from Africa

Kenya

Two elephants believed to have killed two farmers in November have been shot dead. One of the elephants was killed by police at the Laikipia Segera ranch. In the second incident Kenya Wildlife Service wardens shot the elephant. Elsewhere, about 250 elephants have strayed from the Maasai Mara Game Reserve and are harassing village residents in the district. These stray elephants destroyed crops in the area while another group of about 50 terrorized villagers near Kilgoris. Subsequently, two civic leaders threatened to mobilize villagers to kill the elephants. Earlier in November, a man died after an elephant trampled him.

Kenya

Kenya Wildlife Service criticized Kinango MP Rai for his call on area residents to kill rogue wildlife. In reaction to Rai's statement that 24 residents have been killed and many maize farms have been destroyed by elephants in the past 3 years, KWS expressed that leaders in Kinango constituency had blown the elephant problem out of proportion and disputed statistics given by Rai. The MP gave KWS up to December 31 to either contain the rogue animals, failure to which they will face the wrath of the Duruma traditional hunters.

Zimbabwe

The Harare Standard – a government controlled paper – reported about a one-day conference of the Zimbabwe Indigenous Safari Operators Association (ZISOA) and the impact of the land reform on wildlife. Vitalis Chadenga, director with the Department of National Parks and Wildlife Management Authority, said in a read statement that *"little or no attention was paid to the security of wildlife outside the national parks estate and that the problem of poaching was particularly acute during the first 18 months of the program when even flagship species like the rhino became 'incidental' victims of bush meat snaring."* Poaching activities are on the rise since the government embarked on the resettlement of landless blacks on former white commercial properties, including game farms.

In Chadenga's statement the settlement of people on game ranches and indiscriminate burning and cutting down of trees was blamed for in the loss of the geographical range and natural habitats. It has led to the erosion of confidence in the integrity of the country's wildlife management authority as well as undermined the promotion of wildlife farming as legitimate land use option.

The first year of the controversial resettlement program had witnessed about 90% decline in (*photo*)tourist arrivals at game ranches. The extensive poaching that followed had destroyed the resource base beyond redemption in some areas. The destruction of game proof veterinary fences, absence of rehabilitation of game and consequent increase in buffalo/cattle contact, created conditions conducive to the outbreak of foot and mouth disease.

Until 2000, wildlife farming was a major component of agriculture in Zimbabwe. Many white farmers were exploiting the multiple uses of wildlife particularly hunting and eco-tourism. Although protected areas hold more buffalo and elephant populations, commercial farms contributed significantly to the general wildlife estate in Zimbabwe, said natural resources' experts.

Zimbabwe

United Passenger Company (Zupco) chairman and Chinhoyi

Continued on Page 9

Continued from Page 6

2 African Wildlife: Must it be subsidized?

in any case allow the application of own rules. There is reluctance by outsiders to confront the issues at stake as long as "ownership" is being adhered to. Especially worrying are funds that are financed by credit. In most cases it is unlikely that principal and interest will be covered by increased productivity.

The carelessness with which donors including the World Bank are thus presently worsening the debt crisis of Africa is hard to understand.

Second, the donors are pleased with the new instrument of large environmental funds, as this new measure of conservation-financing falls in line with the trend to budget and basket financing and allows easy outflow of funds within development cooperation.

And, thirdly, the various NGOs are content too. Some certainly play an important role in conservation. Others are mainly institutions for the dissemination of certain animal welfare ideologies, and some are primarily "moneymaking machines".

Nevertheless they are all regarded as "stakeholders", and they gain influence by being represented within the boards of trustees of the finance funds. They thus take part in the decision-making on areas where they are normally not resident and also not otherwise legitimized. Often they are also direct beneficiaries of the money spent by such funds. Land owners and people living on the land side by side with the wildlife are equally only regarded as "stakeholders" instead of "right-holders" and normally end up as a minority when decisions are taken which affect them directly, contrary to all the other groups. Their influence to decide on their own affairs is reduced, and the role of outsiders with doubtful or questionable legitimacy is strengthened instead. This might actually in the long run be one of the most important social effects of "sustainable" external finance of wildlife and protected areas in Africa: Those who live on the land side by side with the wildlife are increasingly expropriated and alienated from the decision-making. There are efforts going on in many places in Africa to have the rural population manage and use the wildlife on their land¹²: The aim is to make conservation more effective and at the same time contribute to poverty reduction. Both targets are less likely to be achieved the more outsiders dominate these processes and the more externally controlled subsidies replace self-help.

This paper reflects the personal views of the author only and not necessarily those of the institutions he works for.

Footnotes

1 Baldus, R.D. (2000) Was haben Elefanten mit Ökonomie und Selbsthilfeorganisationen zu tun? In: Kirk, M. et al., Genossenschaften und Kooperation in einer sich wandelnden Welt. Münster, p. 501 f.

2 Baldus, R.D., Kibonde B. and Siege L. (2003) Seeking Conservation Partnerships in the Selous

Game Reserve, Tanzania. PARKS Vol.13 No.1. p. 53 f. and Baldus, R.D., Hahn, R., Kibonde B. and Siege L. (2003) 15 Jahre Naturschutz im Selous. AFZ Der Wald. 21/2003

3 Barnett, R. (2000) Food for Thought: The Utilization of Wild Meat in Eastern and Southern Africa. TRAFFIC East/Southern Africa. Nairobi.

4 World Conservation Union/IUCN (2000), Resolution on the Sustainable Use of Wild-Living Resources, Res. 2.29, World Conservation Congress, Amman.

5 Krug, W. (2002) Maximizing Sustainable National Benefits

from Nature Tourism in Namibia. PhD thesis, Dpt. of Economics, University College London. p. 40 ff.

6 Richard Bell, pers. comm. on 22.6.1988.

7 Eltringham, S.K. (1994) Can Wildlife Pay its Way? Oryx Vol. 28 No.3. p.168.

8 Mack, R., Kloss, R. and Becker, M. (2002) Guide to Sustainable Financing of Biodiversity and Protected Areas. GTZ/ABS-LISTRA. Eschborn (CD-Rom).

9 Cf. the position of the German Ministry for Environment in relation to trophy hunting in Africa and Asia: Grosse, C. et al. (2001) Trophäenjagd auf Gefährdete Arten im Ausland. BfN-Skript 40. Bonn (www.bfn.de).

10 Moye, M. et al. (2000) Preliminary Assessment: The Current Situation and Capacity Building Needs of Environmental Funds in Africa. Interagency Planning Group on Environmental Funds. New York. cf. also the discussions in the finance stream of the World Parks Congress, Durban, September 2003.

11 There is an inflationary and sometimes ridiculous use and misuse of the word "sustainable". We use the term in the sense as it originally was introduced into science by the German Forester Ludwig von Hartig two hundred years ago: "Forests as a natural resource should be used as far as possible, however, only in such a way that coming generations can at least benefit as much as the present one." Hartig, G.L. (1819) Anweisung zur Taxation der Forste oder zur Bestimmung des Holzertrags der Wälder, Gießen 1819. (Own translation).

12 cf. Baldus, R.D. et al. (2001) Experiences with Community Based Wildlife Conservation in Tanzania. Tanzania Wildlife Conservation Discussion Paper No. 29, GTZ, Dar Es Salaam.

This article appeared first in "Internationales Afrikaforum, Weltforum Verlag, München, Germany" and we are gratefully acknowledging permission to reprint Dr. Baldus' article in African Indaba

Continued from Page 3

3 Wildlife as a natural resource

by March 15th of acceptance. The two-page proposal should include the name and complete address of the author(s), the institution and/or organization (if any), the title of the contribution, 5 key words identifying the wildlife resource and the management regime, an abstract of 800 words underlying the experience and/or the lessons which will be conveyed, 10 bibliographical references.

Participants wishing to present a paper/presentation are invited to submit their proposal in French or English on the above and related topics **by 31 January 2004 to** The Symposium Coordinator, International Foundation for the Conservation of Wildlife 15, rue de Téhéran 75008 Paris, France, e-mail: 6iwrs@fondation-igf.fr

For further Symposium information contact IGF, Dr Philippe Chardonnet at 6iwrs@fondation-igf.fr or write to IGF, 15 rue de Téhéran, F-75008, Paris, France. To register and receive information, please contact Viviane Sammarcelli, D TOUR INTERNATIONAL, 18 boulevard de Grenelle, F-75015 Paris, France, Tel: +33 1 53 95 3333 Fax: +33 1 53 95 0333, E-Mail: bonjour@dtour.fr.

The registration form can be downloaded from the IGF website at <http://www.wildlife-conservation.org/>

Continued from Page 7
6 News from Africa

Technical College vice-chancellor Dr Charles Nherera has taken over a bird sanctuary in the Mutorashanga area in Mashonaland West Province in November. Pinefarm Conservancy, popularly known as Cannonkopje Crane Centre, is protected under a bilateral agreement between Zimbabwe and Switzerland. Nherera had his workers deployed to occupy 1/3 of the 1,145-hectare conservancy which he wants to convert into farmland.

Conservancy owner Rolf Hangartner said Nherera first approached him in July with a letter purportedly from the Ministry of Lands for the subdivision of the farm. On November 8, Chinhoyi provincial administrator Christopher Shumba arrived in the company of Mutorashanga police and Nherera to claim ownership of the conservancy. Hangartner, a Swiss national, bought the farm in 1993 with the support of Zvimba rural district council, the South Ayrshire Natural Resources Sub-committee and the Department of National Parks to establish a breeding centre for the endangered wattle cranes.

"The investment of over US\$20 million is protected by the agreement between the Swiss Confederation and the Republic of Zimbabwe on the Promotion and Reciprocal Protection of Investments," Hangartner said. Nherera's move was a clear violation of land redistribution criteria which exclude conservancies and properties protected under country to country agreements.

South Africa

A leopard had to be shot and killed after attacking a dog in an Mpumalanga squatter camp that borders the Kruger National Park. The leopard attacked the dog in Nkanini settlement in Matsulu, just east of Nelspruit and villagers threw stones at it until police arrived and shot the animal dead.

Ethiopia

One of the world's rarest animals is facing a renewed battle against extinction after being hit by a rabies outbreak, a leading wildlife expert has warned. Dr Stuart Williams, a British conservationist fighting to save the critically endangered Ethiopian wolf, said the animal might not survive this latest threat. There are only 500 rare Ethiopian wolves left - an animal as endangered as pandas. The majority live in the remote mountainous areas in the south of the country. "Rabies is the big killer," said Williams, who heads the Ethiopian Wolf Conservation Programme (EWCP). He believes three quarters could die in the outbreak. He has urged the Ethiopian government to back a vaccination campaign for the red-colored wolves. The last rabies outbreak occurred in 1991 when three quarters of the 300 wolves in the Bale Mountains were wiped out, leaving 80 alive. It has taken a decade for their numbers to get back to 1991 levels but the latest outbreak threatens to wipe them out once and for all, according to conservationists.

Zimbabwe

The October invasion of Hippo Pools Wilderness Camp in the 74 000-hectare Umfurudzi National Park turned ugly with Zanu PF youths abducting the camp owner and an American citizen visiting the area. Camp owner Ian Jarvis reported that he was assaulted and abducted together with Ryan Kuja from Garura Eco-Tourism project. They were force-marched for a kilometer while the abductors beat up Jarvis. Jarvis lost Z\$500 000 in cash for staff wages and his suitcase. Kuja lost Z\$100 000 in cash and his bag. Jarvis said he only got an opportunity to escape when money in his

7 A reply to an anti-hunter

By Gerhard R Damm

Saliem Fakir, regional (South Africa) director of IUCN, published an article in Mail & Guardian (October 25th, 2002) titled "The hunting industry must embrace ethical practices". Mr. Fakir - who also receives a regular copy of **African Indaba** - has sent an email some months ago. His comments center in particular on my article "Hunters and Conservationists - Natural Partners" as printed in Vol 11/1 of Africa Geographic (to download the article go to <http://www.africanindaba-2003.netfirms.com/#1>)

He asked to consider publishing his views in **African Indaba**. Space does not permit a full re-print, but our readers should not miss some of Mr Fakir's rather radical views (I quote):

(1) "I think trophy hunting is a blood sport, it should either be banned outright in some cases, or allowed under exceptional circumstances. I don't think that the historical link between traditional forms of hunting and the present version of the blood-sport are one and the same thing. I think your justifications are rather muddled. I would see traditional forms of hunting as one defined by necessity and not for reasons of sport. I think trophy hunting caters for a certain kind of human being that celebrates the love of killing. I don't view this as appropriate for the kind of civilization we are trying to create in the 21st century. I doubt very much that most hunters have a love for conservation, ..."

(2) "On the question as to why hunters hunt? Those, whom I define as hunting outside of necessity. It's simple: they rejoice in the act of killing. Then there follows a whole panoply of other tangential reasons. But, killing is the primary motivation for this. What is the difference between this and Pakistanis watching a scene of two wild bears violently devouring each other, of dogs in a blood feud, or rooster in a blood sport. The only thing here is a human with a gun and a defenceless animal. But the same instinct that ingratiates spectators of other blood sports is to be found in the psyche of the hunter."

(3) "I don't know of any IUCN policy that supports hunting in the direct manner you propose. There is a policy on sustainable use, which can be interpreted as support for hunting. This policy statement is contained in IUCN Congress resolution, and still needs to be translated into a fully fledged guideline. I would think that it exists because it recognizes that in many communities hunting is still an important source of livelihood. But, it is rather vague and open to interpretation on the question of trophy hunting. If you know of any explicit policy that supports trophy hunting I stand to be corrected. Perhaps you should furnish the specific wording that supports your claim?"

Saliem Fakir's argumentation has not changed since October 2002. In M&G he stated "the article expresses Fakir's personal views" at the end of the article. In his mail to me, he says somewhat ambiguous "I am not an animal rightist either. I also write in my personal capacity as the head of the IUCN South Africa." Mr. Fakir now invokes his title as Director South Africa of IUCN.

With regard to IUCN policies and work in progress I suggest that Mr Fakir reads up in the abundant material which IUCN publishes in print and electronic form. A few examples should suffice here, since I do not want to frustrate Mr Fakir's own research efforts!

- Page 13, African Indaba Vol 1/6 "Did you know..."

Continued on Page 10

Continued on Page 12

The Basis for Hunting is Conservation

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

Hunters Observe a Code of Ethics

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

Hunters & Hunting Project a Positive Image

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

8 Lion charge video

During the last month of 2003 hunters (and anti-hunters) were "treated" on the internet to a video of a lion "hunt" with some footage of a male lion charging into a group of hunters. On closer examination one can clearly see that this lion safari was one of the infamous "canned hunts" or, to name the case correctly, canned shootings or killings.

At the first glance the footage is exciting but closer examination will show a number of things which set this so-called "lion hunt" apart from a real hunt, irrespective of the danger some of the participants put themselves in. The ingredients of a real hunt are definitely missing – i. e. the realistic chance for the hunted animal to escape (fence posts and fence are visible on the frames and the lion – obviously not used to be free to roam - makes no attempt to escape the hunters although he was clearly aware of them even at the earliest stages of the video).

One can note furthermore the inadequate shooting abilities of the client and the professional hunter (and of the numerous bystanders to boot); none of them kept their nerve under pressure, with the exception of the cameraman/women. The lives of all persons were obviously more in danger by the quantity of lead flying around than by the lion charge. Sort of reminded me of the "famous" Mark Sullivan videos – with the sole difference, that Sullivan is a better shot!

It is such videos – obviously taken to impress friends and clients – and more though the practice of such killing sprees that have given dangerous game hunting in South Africa a bad name – not only within the hunting fraternity, but most importantly with the general public. This video was discussed extensively by members of the [Accurate Reloading Forum](#). Follow the link to African Big Game hunting and read the recent threads with lion video in the subject lines. .

Continued from Page 9

6 News from Africa

pocket fell out, thus diverting the attention of his attackers who stopped to pick it up.

Jarvis said police at Shamva were delaying investigations into the case. Shamva police confirmed the invasion of the camp saying one of the youths' leaders from Madziwa Mine had taken the car keys and an officer was investigating the case. Jarvis said police were reluctant to guarantee the safety of his clients visiting Hippo Pools. Therefore the camp cannot be reopened until the equipment is recovered and security guaranteed. When Hippo Pools was first invaded in October, booked clients were forced to vacate the place in the middle of the night. He said clients who were forcibly evicted claimed to have left behind equipment worth over a million dollars. The invaders also looted food valued at Z\$500 000. Jarvis was forced to hand over all camp keys.

Zambia

Tourism, Environment and Natural Resources minister Patrick Kalifungwa said that the Zambian Government has put in place measures aimed at improving the monitoring of illegal killings of elephants. He was speaking in Livingstone mid November when he officially opened the SCI sponsored Africa wildlife consultative forum on international trade in endangered species at Zambezi Sun. Mr. Kalifungwa also said government was committed to improving the safari hunting industry. So far, a lot of agreements have been entered into between safari outfitters and the government through ZAWA. Kalifungwa commended Safari Club International (SCI) for the support rendered to the trans-frontier initiative in the Zimoza area which encompasses three countries, Zimbabwe, Mozambique and Zambia, since the Zimoza area had great potential for improved wildlife conservation, including safari hunting. ZAWA director general Hapenga Kabeta said African wildlife conservation forum was primarily a platform for the protected area managers in SADC member states to consult each other and share experiences and challenges that they faced in the wildlife management and he commended Safari Club International (SCI) for their special interest in wildlife management. The delegates attending the forum include chief executive officers and senior management officials of the government, wildlife agencies in the SADC region and Cameroon in Central Africa.

Zambia

Zambia's endangered White Rhino population has depleted further following the death of one of the five White Rhinos that were introduced to Mosi-u-tunya National Park in 1995. Zambia Wildlife Authority (ZAWA) Director General Kabenga Hapenga said a white rhino was found floating on the Zambezi river.

Zambia News Agency reports that Mr. Hapenga said the organization suspects that the animal died after a fight with another rhino which he said sustained wounds on the head and back. Earlier on the Director General pointed out that the population of the white rhino, since its re-introduction in 1995, had not increased due to environmental factors.

South Africa

With fewer than 250 breeding pairs left, the Riverine Rabbit (*Bunolagus monticularis*) could soon join the ranks of vanished creatures. It is expected to become even rarer through direct threats like the loss or fragmentation of habitation, trapping and subsistence hunting and feral cats and dogs. The Riverine Rabbit

Continued on Page 11

Continued from Page 10

6 News from Africa

– the only burrowing rabbit in Africa - found only in the central Karoo region of South Africa, is recognized by its distinctive long ears, a black-brown stripe on its lower jaw, and a dark fluffy tail, which is visible when the rabbit hops away. Already considered one of the rarest animals in the world, the Riverine Rabbit produces only one offspring a year and about four in a lifetime. In the 2003 [IUCN Red List of Threatened Species](#) the riverine rabbit is listed as critically endangered.

Zimbabwe

A rhino awareness program for rural schools in southern Zimbabwe will soon be implemented in 8 primary schools situated in the Maranda Communal Lands near the Bubiana Conservancy. This is the first phase of a project, which seeks to develop an approach towards stimulating awareness of rhino conservation in rural schools. This will in turn help communities understand their important and positive role in the survival of the rhino. The schools chosen for the initial phase are typical rural Zimbabwe schools where structures and services are basic and many do not have sufficient classroom space for their student populations.

South Africa

Communities and game farmers in drought-stricken KwaZulu-Natal have started ringing alarm bells in November that unless something is done, mass-scale famine and farmers going under remained a stark reality. The areas affected by the two-year drought stretch from Mtubatuba, inland to Hlabisa going up to Hluhluwe and Mkhuzi. The latter is the worst hit, with the main Mkhuzi River almost dry.

Gerdus Diedericks, a game and cattle farmer, who also chairs the local Bhiyela and Northern Zululand Farmers' said, he had already lost more than 150 animals including zebra, impala and reedbuck. At Mkhuzi Game Reserve some of the pans have run dry, resulting in animals such as hippos, and crocodiles migrating in search of water. The conservation manager at the reserve, Herbert Mthembu, said 23 rhinos had been relocated to the eastern shores in St Lucia recently because of lack of water.

Kenya

Leaders in Taita Taveta District have opposed the planned transfer of 400 elephants to Tsavo National Park by the Kenya Wildlife Service. They said no major decisions should be made on the park without consulting the local people. Taveta MP Naomi Shaban said the KWS could not keep the existing elephants within the park. She added that elephants had killed people and destroyed crops and asked how KWS was going to handle an additional 400 animals. Dr Shaban said KWS applied double standards when dealing with human/wildlife conflict. She cited a case where game wardens killed 32 cows for straying into the park in Taveta Division, while little or nothing was done when the elephants destroyed crops and property. Mr Calist Mwatela, a member of the East African Regional Assembly, said there was need to overhaul the Wildlife Act. The chairman of Taita Taveta county council said the elephants had trampled 3 people to death in Mwaktau location alone since the beginning of 2003. He called for urgent Government action or residents would take the law into their own hands.

Zambia

Traditional rulers from 4 countries in Southern Africa were meeting in the Zambian city Livingstone to discuss natural resources. The chiefs from Zambia, Zimbabwe, Botswana and Na-

mbia attended a regional community Transboundary Natural Resources Management (TBNRM) workshop organized by the African Wildlife Foundation. The workshop aimed at improving cooperation among neighboring communities in the management of natural resources such as the Zambezi River in the four corners Transboundary Natural Resources Management Area (TBNRMA).

Zimbabwe

Zimbabwe's annual inflation rate hit 620% in November, according to official statistics issued on December 16th 2003. Measured against the previous month, the rate rose 33.6%, against 25% in October. Meanwhile, interest rates hit 635% on December 17th 2003, the state-controlled daily *Herald* newspaper reported. Finance company executives warn of a looming banking industry crash. President Robert Mugabe still exercises full control over the country's finances has denounced calls for the devaluation of the currency as "treason". Once second in Africa only to South Africa's economy, Zimbabwe now has the highest inflation rate in the world and the fastest falling gross domestic product.

Nigeria

A lively illegal trade in ivory is flourishing in Nigeria, Ivory Coast and Senegal. Ivory Coast banned the trade in 1997, and it is supposed to be controlled by law in Senegal and Nigeria. But a report by [TRAFFIC](#) and [WWF](#) says investigators found more than 4,000 kilograms of "illegal" ivory on public display in 9 cities. The report is entitled "More Ivory than Elephants: Domestic Ivory Markets in three West African Countries". One of its authors, Tom Milliken, of TRAFFIC, said much of the ivory found on sale came from the DR Congo, Cameroon, CAR and Gabon. These countries make up Africa's most troubled region for elephant conservation. Dr Lieberman of WWF said: "Not only is there a lack of political will to implement [CITES](#), allowing traders to act with immunity from prosecution, but corruption is preventing effective controls The report makes it also clear that not all the responsibility for the trade belongs to the 3 countries themselves. It says the main buyers of the ivory are expatriates, tourists, and business visitors from France and Italy, China and South Korea, and the US. In some cases diplomats are involved.

Botswana

The number of elephants in Botswana bulged by 6% per annum since 1987. IUCN said on December 4th. Botswana's "probable", figure is further reported to include 1262 elephants in the Tuli Block and 120,604 elephants in the north. Botswana's elephant population is further reported by IUCN to be growing at the rate of 6% ([African Elephant Database 2002](#)).

South Africa

A game ranger suffered a broken pelvis when an elephant gored him in the Kapama Private Game Reserve near Hoedspruit early January but suffered no injury to his internal organs. Senior Kapama ranger Henry Parsons was tusked by Jimmy, an 18 year bull, which is used by the reserve for elephant-back photographic safaris, during the morning walk. Jimmy carried two tourists on his back during the incident. It is reported that the Jimmy's handler prevented the development of a worse scenario.

Tanzania

The Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism, Mr. Solomon Odunga while opening the fourth annual meeting of scientists and wildlife researchers in Arusha, announced that the wildlife sector contributes 13% of the Gross National Product (GNP) and offers employment opportunities to over

Continued on Page 16

Continued from Page 9

7 A reply to an anti-hunter

- Page 6, African Indaba Vol 1/1 "An opinion from IUCN", Dr R Estes, Chair IUCN Antelope Commission
- [IUCN Sustainable Use Specialist Group](#)
- [IUCN Southern Africa SUSG](#)
- IUCN Caprinae Specialist Group [Statement on Trophy Hunting](#)
- ESA Comment by IUCN SUSG Chair (see page 13)

The title of Mr. Fakir's October 2002 article "*The hunting industry must embrace ethical practices*" is already misleading, since it implies that the hunting industry's practices in general are unethical. This is certainly as untrue as the grossly wrong figures quoted with regard to the economic value of hunting for a number of African countries. Mr. Fakir says in his article that "*hunting does not reflect the best side of humanity, that [the hunting] instinct can best be described perverse*" and that "*numbers of the hunting industry are associated with the most dysfunctional ideologies in our society*". Mr. Fakir's slogans like "dehumanization, blood sports, lowest form of human instincts, etc." indeed sound like the international conflict industry's vintage animal rights activists.

Ethical practices – especially with regard to a "conservation ethos" - need to be continuously employed whilst hunting. This requirement, however, applies to all conservation related organizations and individuals, inclusive of scientist, wildlife managers and to all consumptive and non-consumptive wildlife users. All must embrace ethical practices – in their action within the natural environment and also in their interactions with each other. I assume that the later could also be expected of the representative of IUCN in South Africa! Mr. Fakir should adhere to the rules of civilized dialogue, correct representation of facts and figures, and refrain from the demagogic use of language and insulting slogans!

Trophy hunting does not accord with Mr. Fakir's personal notions, and his emotionally charged argumentation resembles rather an environmental ideologue from the global conflict industry than an IUCN representative. There are numerous examples where IUCN members following the principles of the World Conservation Strategy cooperate with hunters. Last not least, one of the oldest international hunting organizations, the [International Council for Game and Wildlife Conservation CIC](#) is a respected IUCN member.

I certainly am willing to tolerate Mr. Fakir's democratic right to refrain from killing animals, I am accepting that he does not have the wish to hunt, I do not have a problem if he decides to go vegan but please, Mr. Fakir, also respect the democratic right of those who have elected to follow the most ancient human heritage, those persons who enjoy nature by actively interacting with it in a participatory way, and whose actions have produced a proud and visible track record in conservation!

Maybe we hunters nowadays use too often justifications which center on ecological and habitat related arguments. These arguments are important for the common good, and as such of importance. For the individual hunter there is an additional and very important argument - he experiences an emotional "kick" when hunting! It is hard to describe, but factors like the passion for all things wild and natural, the heightened sensitivity for the natural environment, the tension of the stalk and the adrenalin surge when closing in on a trophy animal, and many more rather individualistic reasons play a significant role for the hunter.

Modern man has been removed from nature; most people to-

day experience nature only from books and television, at the most from a short visit in a nature reserve. The hunter, in contrast, lives a participatory relationship with nature; he immerses himself into nature in the act of hunting. Ortega y Gasset mentions that the hunter searches the interaction with the wild animal, enters into the animal's realm; enjoys the pursuit of the quarry and the challenge to his senses and instincts. The natural instincts of the hunter are not buried under a mound of "modern" influences and the hunter consciously strives to return to the roots of humankind! Life and death are inexorably linked ever since the first life-form emerged on this planet – the trophy hunter of modern times has refined this eternal connection into a highly selective ritual, quite contrary to the subsistence hunter praised by Mr. Fakir. The subsistence hunter kills by whatever means are most effective and fast, his objective is neither fair chase nor sustainability, but economy of scale! There are numerous examples where the "noble" subsistence hunter exterminated entire populations and species – the advancing human migration across the Bering land bridge into the Americas is a prime example.

When the fatal shot is fired, the trophy hunter proudly takes possession of the quarry, often enough not without a subtle feeling of regret! This has frequently been called the "emotional hunting paradox". The hunter does not seek the destruction of an individual animal, but he experiences a conclusion of the hunt only, if he is successful in killing the animal. Killing the pursued animal is the logical and natural conclusion of trophy hunting and hence its primary objective.

One must not confound this with the **primary objective of the trophy hunter**, however. The modern trophy hunter – in contrast to the subsistence hunter – is not primarily interested in the death of an animal. He is interested in all what he has to embark upon in achieving it! In pursuing this objective the hunter does something good for himself, and at the same time promotes conservation, (I assume that Mr Fakir has yet to study the implications of compensatory mortality on animal populations). This is trophy hunting today – we do not hunt to kill, but we kill to have hunted! ... And since the hunt does not necessarily always end with the death of an animal – more often than not it escapes – the hunter is challenged to go out and try again and again!

It seems appropriate to mention the Scottish philosopher and economist Adam Smith, who created the still valid assertion in "*The Wealth of Nations*" that *the invisible hand of the market translates the pursuit of self-interest into a public benefit*. In pursuing one's own interest, the common good of society is promoted more effectively than by consciously and directly working for it.

The hunter has a high interest to continuously experience the emotional "kick" of pursuing game, and to occasionally kill the quarry. Due to this self-interest the community of modern trophy hunters will hunt "sustainably", i. e. in a way that there is always sufficient game to satisfy the desires of the hunters. This self-interest of the hunter benefits society and the nation, and last not least the international conservation efforts. I am a trophy hunter, I have been all my life like generations of my family before me – and I am proud of it!

Mr. Fakir's professed [private or semiprivate] opinion and the simultaneous reference to his position in IUCN South Africa are inappropriate and inconsistent with the aims and objectives of this great organization.

There are numerous vociferous and vitriolic animal rights organizations around – Mr Fakir should consider joining them!

9 USF&W Draft Policy for enhancement of survival permits for "endangered" foreign species

During the month of October the South African CIC Delegation and the SCI African Chapter wrote letters to Chief Peter Thomas, USF&W Division Management Authority in support of the draft policy for enhancement of survival permits for "endangered" foreign species. We were assisted in drafting the letters by [Conservation Force](#) and John Jackson III. It was heartening to see the overwhelming support of various government departments, scientists and hunting and conservation organizations for the ESA proposal. Obviously the radical animal rights was violently opposed and via their websites and public announcements succeeded in having USF&W flooded with negative comments. We sincerely hope that the US authorities will listen to facts and hard evidence instead of emotionally influenced pseudo-arguments. For your information we print also extracts from some of the letters written by members of the sustainable use community:

Dr Jon Hutton, FFI Africa Program, Chair, [IUCN SSC Sustainable Use Specialist Group](#)

(in connection with this draft proposal): "Assuming you agree with our analysis that this is, finally, a positive move in the right direction, your comment should make it clear that you support the proposed policy, you agree that the policy is already authorized by the ESA and regulations and feel that it will encourage conservation in foreign nations (including your own if relevant). There are some potential problems with the draft policy. Permits will only be issued when it benefits the species to the satisfaction of the USF&WS. What constitutes a satisfactory finding? If the bar is set too high in this regard nothing will change except a formalization of the practice of not issuing permits. Criteria too expensive, restrictive and impossible could be established. We do not want an approach that is too narrow.

Ministry of Environment & Tourism, Namibia (Malan Lindique, Permanent Secretary)

... The Ministry of Environment and Tourism of Namibia, as the CITES Management Authority and the agency principally responsible for the protection of Namibia's biodiversity, wishes to indicate its support for the proposed changes to the Endangered Species Act policy (159 FR 49512) to allow the importation of foreign species listed under this Act. We see this as a positive development. We firmly believe that range States are in the best position to ensure the well-being of species and their natural habitats, and every attempt should be made to support their conservation efforts, rather than place barriers that undermine these programs. The proposed policy change will encourage and facilitate the conservation of foreign species listed under the ESA through the economic incentives for conservation that can be created through the sustainable use of such species. (The hunting of such species under controlled conditions is a low-impact and economically favourable way of achieving such use, but is of course dependent on the ability of non-resident hunters to import trophies into their country of residence). We also consider it to be very

Continued on Page 14

10 AWF in DR Congo

The future of the Bonobo and other species in the Congo Basin is looking brighter thanks to two milestones in conservation. Both the passing of the Congo Basin Forest Partnership Act and [African Wildlife Foundation's](#) (AWF) launch of its newest Heartland in the Maringa/Lopori-Wamba landscape, promise hope for the wildlife of the Congo Basin. This news is particularly welcome to the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) as it emerges from five years of civil war.

Earlier this year, the U.S. Senate passed the Congo Basin Forest Partnership (CBFP) Act, HR 2264. According to Senator Lamar Alexander (R-TN), Chairman of the African Affairs Subcommittee and featured speaker at AWF's recent "Conservation is Good Business" Symposium, the Senate acted unanimously to help protect this region. This bill authorizes U.S. participation in the CBFP which aims to protect 11 key landscapes encompassing more than 30 national parks and thousands of square miles across six countries in central Africa. AWF, a partner of the CBFP, has been given the lead role of carrying out a conservation program in the Lopori-Wamba landscape, the anchor of AWF's new Congo Basin Heartland. The Maringa/Lopori-Wamba landscape is a vast region located south of the Congo River in north central DRC. This landscape is home to several wildlife species that are found only in the Congo Basin, including the bonobo, a lesser known relative of the chimpanzee, and the Congo peacock.

The challenge in this region is particularly daunting. The wilderness of the Congo Basin is in a desperate state after years of civil strife, tremendous refugee crises, and overzealous logging. These have devastated sections of this critical rainforest and have left local people in abject poverty and dependent on unsustainable resource management practices.

As is the case in all its African Heartland work, AWF will work with various stakeholders in this landscape, including local communities, logging companies and international organizations. Together, these stakeholders will together build and strengthen the region's infrastructure and capacity to ensure the conservation of this precious landscape and its endangered wildlife.

For more than 40 years, AWF, together with the people of Africa, works to ensure the wildlife and wild lands of Africa will endure forever. AWF has invested training and resources in African individuals and institutions that have gone on to play critical roles in conservation. AWF has significantly increased scientific understanding of Africa's extraordinary ecosystems through research and pioneered the use of community conservation and conservation enterprise to demonstrate that wildlife can be conserved while people's well being is also improved.

Zimbabwe

- Zimbabwe has the fastest shrinking economy in the world,
- Zimbabwe has the highest percentage of food insecurity and potentially starving people anywhere in the world,
- Zimbabwe has the highest inflation rate in the world,
- Zimbabwe has more than 3.5 million of its 11.7 million population living outside of its borders,
- Zimbabwe has a life expectancy that has reduced dramatically to 37 years and is still falling,
- Zimbabwe has seen the decimation of more than half its wildlife in the last 4 years,
- Zimbabwe has seen more than half a million people illegally and forcibly evicted out of their homes over the last 4 years.

Continued from Page 13

9 USF&W Draft Policy

important that practical criteria be used to determine those species for which imports will be allowed, to avoid the burden of proof becoming too cumbersome for range States and thereby effectively invalidate the objectives of this change in policy, if adopted ... We believe that the time is right to expand this working incentive-based system to other species as well, and we congratulate the Fish and Wildlife Service for proposing this particular policy amendment. We remain fully committed to manage our wildlife resources sustainably and with the participation of disadvantaged rural communities, as provided for under our own policy and legal frameworks.

[Wildlife Management International](#), Australia (Professor Grahame Webb, NTU)

I would like to congratulate the Government of the United States of America for the proposed initiative contained in the Federal Register: August 18, 2003 (Volume 68, Number 159, Page 49512-49518) which outlines pragmatic and important steps that the United States of America can take to encourage in-situ conservation action.

It is fully compliant with a precautionary response to conservation problems, is consistent with policies, guidelines and actions recommended by the IUCN (World Conservation Union), CITES and the CBD, and if given a reasonable chance to work will very quickly result in definitive conservation advantages being accrued ... I certainly offer my strongest support for the proposed changes.

[International Foundation for the Conservation of Wildlife](#), France (Philippe Chardonnet, Director IGF)

... As an international conservation organization member of IUCN and concerned with not only conservation, but also development of Third World countries based on the sustainable use of their renewable natural resources, we have been confronted in the past with difficulties coming from what was considered as protectionist barriers set up by the US Fish and Wildlife Service preventing the import of hunting trophies legally obtained by US sportsmen in the Range States, according to international law (CITES regulations) as well as with the national legislation of the countries of origin. ...

Since approximately 50% of the world's trophy hunters are US citizens, this prohibition for these sportsmen to bring home their hunting trophies has had a profound impact on some developing countries due to the loss of possible income emanating from the sustainable use of game species as a natural resource. ...

As far as sport hunted trophies are concerned, we are confident that sport hunters will assume the cost of import permits, as they assume already the cost of funding of wildlife and, national park departments in trophy animal range states through payment of trophy fees, hunting licenses, etc.

As far as the need for an environmental assessment for foreign species, we would be very glad to see the US F&WS get involved in obtaining a significant budget to carry out or co-finance such assessments in the Range States, in collaboration with Range countries administrations.

An environmental assessment is however usually an expensive operation and we would not like to have this type of requirement used as an excuse not to issue permits which are legally authorized under range state legislation and CITES procedures....

South African Delegation of the International Council for Game and Wildlife Conservation (CIC)

... CIC recognizes the fact that regulated recreational hunting is one of the foremost factors contributing towards wildlife and habitat conservation in Africa, at the same time providing much needed economic upliftment for rural populations which have otherwise few alternatives of participation in the economic life of the African nations. ... In African wildlife management, the international call for the application of the Precautionary Principle very often restrains the actions of African wildlife specialists. It is therefore essential that this unsatisfactory situation be analyzed. The application of the Precautionary Principle has resulted in North/South tensions, in equity concerns, in possible infringements of the right to development and, most clearly, in poor conservation outcomes. It is for these reasons that it seems that the application of Precautionary Principle in wildlife conservation in general and wildlife management in particular, is badly in need of examination.

We are of the opinion that the Participatory Principle is crucial for the effectiveness and legitimacy of conservation related actions. Because of the relative lack of "scientific" tools and indicators, which can give decision makers (wildlife managers in Africa and permitting authorities overseas, i.e. USA and European Union) instant answers, a broad based participation of local rights-holders is essential for lasting successful solutions. Developing and using consensus-building and conflict-resolution techniques should therefore be an important element of down-to-earth conservation and wildlife management. The necessity and value of recognizing non-scientific forms of knowledge, including indigenous and traditional knowledge, both in assessing risk and in formulating courses of action are obvious. Local rural people do have detailed understandings of threats to conservation that are not reflected in scientific evidence....

Adaptive management is an alternative means of responding to uncertainty and has become a practical means of risk management in wildlife conservation in Africa and round the World. It is described as a self-conscious experimental approach involving incremental hypothesis formulation and testing. As compared to the application of the Precautionary Principle, benefits of adaptive management include its greater dynamism and ability to respond to new information. ... Scientists tend to be paralysed by the complexity of issues and a varying number of hypotheses, therefore continuously calling for more research. To prove that point, one has just to read the recommendations at the end of many scientific studies of wildlife. If humanity acted only on the basis of 100% proof, we would achieve too little too late. The "international conflict industry" based in first world countries and trying to influence sovereign matters of emerging countries thrives on this apparent lack of comprehensive conclusions to further own objectives!

Solutions must be reached within a predetermined timeframe. Extensions of the time frame rarely make much difference in knowledge gained or conclusions reached! Within the framework of "adaptive management", a pragmatic "strategy of the attainable" will do infinitely more for people and wildlife, than endless bitter debates!

It is imperative that wildlife managers in Africa, members of rural communities, landowners and all true conservationists remain focused on their objective, i.e. ongoing search for the best possible solutions for wildlife and people! For most certainly, the rural African communities and individuals will have to live with the results!

Continued on Page 15

11 Selous Conservation Program

"The Selous Game Reserve generates its revenue from tourism. Some 80% is derived from 'safari hunting', the other from game viewing. 50% of this revenue is retained by the reserve."

Project Area

With an area of around 48,000 square kilometres, representing 6% of Tanzania's land surface, the Selous Game Reserve is the largest protected area in Africa. It encompasses a wide variety of wildlife habitats, including open grasslands, acacia and Miombo woodlands and riverine forests. The reserve contains some of the largest and most important populations of elephants, buffalos and wild dogs in Africa. About 60% of Tanzania's elephants are found there. With its extensive area of Miombo forests, the Selous is one of the largest forest areas under protection.

Background

During the 1980's the rapid increase in poaching for ivory and rhino horn led to a catastrophic decline in Tanzania's elephant and rhino populations. The Government of Tanzania approached the international community for assistance in initiating programs to conserve its wildlife resources. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany responded to this request and agreed to include the joint 'Selous Conservation Programme' (SCP) in their bilateral cooperation agreement.

Objectives

The objectives of the SCP are:

- to safeguard the existence and ecological integrity of the Selous Game Reserve as a conservation area
- to significantly reduce conflicts between the reserve and the local population by developing mechanisms to make the protected area a vehicle for rural development for the local communities

Approach and Strategies

SCP aims at reconciling nature conservation with the needs of the people living with wildlife. The villages protect their wildlife by deploying village scouts, and they market wildlife by introducing tourism for their benefit and by selling meat for local consumption from a sustainable offtake.

Activities

1. Assistance to the Reserve

A major component of the SCP is to give support to the reserve's administration. SCP has concentrated on the following fields of support:

- preparation of a management plan
- provision of vehicles, including lorries and a tanker, as well as boats
- improvement of communications by establishing an integrated VHF-HF radio network for stations, outposts, patrols, vehicles and aircraft
- rehabilitation of the basic road system
- advisory services and training
- support to the administration, including business and economic aspects of reserve management

Continued on Page 16

Continued from Page 15
9 USF&W Draft Policy

SCI African Chapter

... Issuing permits for trophies taken in regulated hunting activities is an important factor important in strengthening African range nations' conservation programs since the future of Africa's wildlife depends on a strong policy of sustainable use of wild natural resources. By issuing trophy import permits for the African trophies of American hunters, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service would give full consideration and weight to many instances of meaningful conservation and other benefits from the African nations' conservation programs. The establishment of a "likely" net benefit would only increase in the course of the action, since many conservation projects in Africa depend on funds generated by sport hunters. The full integration of American sport hunters could only accelerate an already very visible process. Particularly when the risks are low or practically non-existent such as in low volume, low risk tourist safari hunting of a limited number of surplus adult males. It is very unlikely, if not almost inconceivable, that modern regulated tourist hunting would endanger any listed game animal...

The comment of the South African Delegation of the International Council for Game and Wildlife Conservation (CIC) and of the SCI African Chapter has been submitted in conjunction with and fully supporting the comment submitted by John Jackson III on behalf of Conservation Force, Dallas Safari Club, Dallas Ecological Foundation, Houston Safari Club, the African Safari Club of Florida, the National Taxidermist Association, International Professional Hunters Association, Professional Hunters' Association of South Africa and the Louisiana Chapter of Safari Club International.

The CIC comment and SCI African Chapter comment was signed by Gerhard R Damm in his capacities as member of the CIC Delegation South Africa and president of the SCI African Chapter.

African Conservation Organizations

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Continued from Page 11

6 News from Africa

150,000 Tanzanians all over the country.

More than 20 experts from within and outside the country attended the three day meeting of the Tanzania Wildlife Research Institute (TAWIRI) in which some 50 papers on research work were presented and discussed. The annual meeting was organized by TAWIRI in collaboration with the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism and funded by the Frankfurt Zoological Society and the Federal Republic of Germany and the Wildlife Conservation Society of the United States of America.

South Africa

The Endangered Wildlife Trust has appointed Dr. Nicholas King as the new director of the Trust. Dr. King previously headed BioNet-International based in the UK.

South Africa

The Raptor Conservation Group – a working group of EWT – points out that all raptor species are protected in South Africa and that permits are required to utilize any part. Even when found dead on the road or in the veld the finder has to acquire a permit for the collection and transportation from the nearest police station resp. a permission letter from the landowner. Taxidermists in South Africa have been advised to make sure that the prescribed documents are available before working on a carcass.

European Union

Documents explaining the legal obligation that apply to personal and non-commercial use of wildlife when traveling, i.e. hunting trophies and souvenirs, can be downloaded from this website www.eu-wildlifetrade.org. Additional information about this topic can be taken from the TRAFFIC website www.traffic.org

Continued from Page 15

11 Selous Conservation Program

- monitoring the reserve's wildlife resources

In cooperation with SCP/GTZ, the German financial cooperation agency Kreditanstalt fuer Wiederaufbau (KfW) is funding an exercise to map the reserve, to demarcate its borders, and to rehabilitate roads.

2. Community Wildlife Management

The project introduces mechanisms for community based wildlife conservation in the villages around the Selous. This includes:

- equipping and training of village scouts
- supporting the formation of village natural resources management committees
- assisting communities in the administration of their wildlife areas
- where appropriate supporting the formation of wildlife management associations.

Because the problems of conservation cannot be solved in isolation of community needs, SCP assists the villagers with other rural development schemes. All programs are based on self-help and self-determination by the villagers involved. The project supports the Wildlife Division in all aspects of Community Based Conservation (CBC), in particular training and

equipping the District Game Officers and supporting and supervising the activities of the communities.

Partners

SCP is a program of the Wildlife Division in the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism. The activities are to a large extent carried out by the staff of Wildlife Division, Districts and Regional Administration. The SCP staff, consisting of 3 senior officers (2 GTZ, 1 Tanzanian) is mainly advising and monitoring the program. SCP cooperates with non-governmental organizations which also support or have supported the Selous, such as the Frankfurt Zoological Society, the African Wildlife Foundation and the World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF).

Achievements

1. Selous Game Reserve

When the SCP was started in 1988, poaching in the Selous GR, particularly for elephant and rhino, had reached disastrous levels. The SCP joined in the efforts of the Government of Tanzania and the international community to end poaching. By 1991, elephant poaching in Selous GR had been virtually halted. Sadly, by then the elephant population had been reduced from the former 100,000 recorded in the 1970's to less than a third of this number. The newest aerial survey, however, showed an increase of the elephants to more than 55,600 (1998).

The Selous GR is presently effectively safeguarded, even though occasional ivory poaching takes place in some areas bordering the reserve. As a result of SCP's efforts the Game Scout force is well equipped, paid and motivated and therefore more effective in the field. In all stations and substations around 160 houses have been built for the reserve's work force and other infrastructure has been set up with the aim of improving general living conditions of the Game Scouts. The retention scheme promoted by SCP enables the Selous GR to meet its major management costs from its own resources.

The Selous Game Reserve generates its revenue from tourism. Some 80% is derived from 'safari hunting', the other from game viewing. 50% of this revenue is retained by the reserve. The additional projects entitled "Mapping and Border Demarcation" (KfW-funded) and "Installation of a Radio Communication System for the Selous" are greatly improving the capability of the Selous GR administration to manage the reserve effectively. The radio communication system is working now in most parts of the Selous.

2. Community Wildlife Management Programme

There are now 50 villages in 5 districts participating. They have developed land use plans with the assistance of the respective Land Development Offices and with the financial support of SCP. In this exercise they have identified Wildlife Management Areas. The land use survey includes the provision of land certificates to the villages. The villages benefit by being provided with a sustainable hunting quota. In return, they are required to appoint and equip village scouts, who patrol their village wildlife management areas. The villages derive revenue from the sale of meat from their quota, and SCP provides training on the administration of these funds. There is empirical evidence that poaching in the buffer zones has decreased significantly and that wildlife is now coming back to areas where it has been absent for many years. As a result, crop damage conflicts are on the increase.

Source: <http://wildlife-programme.gtz.de/wildlife/scp.html>