



Community Benefits from Tourist Safari Hunting (Revised 29 July 2025)

Table 1: Summary of community-based natural resource management programs and related benefits from hunting tourism across countries with available data.

	Ethiopia¹⁻²	Mozambique³⁻⁴	Namibia^{5,6,7}	Tanzania^{8,9,10}	Zambia^{11,12,13}	Zimbabwe¹⁴⁻¹⁵
Community Based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM) Program	Controlled Hunting Areas (CHA) Open Hunting Areas (OHA) Community Wildlife Conservation Areas (CWCA)	Thcuma Tchato Chepenje Chetu Niassa CBNRM	Communal Conservancies Associations Community Forests fishery reserves	Wildlife Management Areas (WMAs) District Councils (DCs)	Game Management Areas (GMAs)	Communal Areas Management Programme for Indigenous Resources (CAMPFIRE)
CBNRM Area	18,545 km ² (0.02% of Ethiopia)	36,418 km ² (4.5% of Mozambique)	185,809 km ² (22.6% of Namibia) 166,179 km ² for conservancies only	30,000 km ² (3.0% of Tanzania)	177,404 km ² (23.6% of Zambia)	56,135 km ² (14.4% of Zimbabwe)
No. of Inhabitants/ Beneficiaries of CBNRM	34 CBO Average 69,120 people	NA	244,587 people	2,000,000+ people	NA	200,000 households are direct beneficiaries 600,000 households benefit from related social services
No. of CBNRM Units (e.g., Districts, WMAs, Conservancies)	27 CHAs 5 OHAs 3 CWCA	2 programs	86 Communal Conservancies 3 Associations 47 community forests 20 fishery reserves	37 registered WMAs	36 GMAs 75 registered Community Resource Boards	33 Rural District Councils

	Ethiopia ^{1–2}	Mozambique ^{3–4}	Namibia ^{5, 6, 7}	Tanzania ^{8, 9, 10}	Zambia ^{11, 12, 13}	Zimbabwe ^{14–15}
No. of CBNRM Units Benefiting from Hunting	32 conservation hunting concessions	45 registered communities	57 conservation hunting concessions	16 of 17 original WMAs	22 GMAs lease 36 hunting concessions	13 Rural District Councils (>1,000 villages)
Percent of Hunting Fees Shared with Communities	85% to respective regions Regions share 60% of trophy fees with respective districts 15% to national treasury	Trophy and concession fees countrywide minimum: 20% Trophy fees in Tchuma Tchato: 33% Some communities are also allocated quotas with 100% fee retention in addition to payment from hunting operators	100%	Block Fees: 75% to WMA and 25% to TAWA Game Fees: 55% to WMA, 25% to TAWA, 10% to District Council, 10% to Central Treasury Conservation Fees: 45% to WMA, 25% to TAWA, 5% to District Council, 25% to Central Treasury Observers Fees: 60% to WMA, 25% to TAWA, 5% to District Council, 10% to Central Treasury Permit Fees: 30% to WMA, 25% to TAWA, 5% to District Council, 40% to Central Treasury	Game Fees: 50% Concession Fees: 20%	100%. Distributed 55% to Wards, 41% to Rural District Council, 4% to CAMPFIRE Association
Sample of Hunting Revenues Shared under CBNRM Program	2018–19: 21,858,264 ETB to direct beneficiaries 4500 jobs	2013: 44,915,000 MTM 2014: 37,585,000 MTM 2015: 44,081,000 MTM	2023: 45,549,374 NAD 1998–2022: \$45,964,012 USD	2010: \$100,811 USD 2011: \$197,582 USD 2012: \$114,377 USD 2013: \$429,887 USD 2014: \$494,560 USD	2013: 5,246,777 ZMW 2014: 5,203,554 ZMW 2015: 3,368,391 ZMW 2017: 7,275,717 ZMW	Fees from key species: 2013: \$2.2 million USD 2014: \$1.8 million USD 2015: \$1.6 million USD

	Ethiopia^{1–2}	Mozambique^{3–4}	Namibia^{5, 6, 7}	Tanzania^{8, 9, 10}	Zambia^{11, 12, 13}	Zimbabwe^{14–15}
	USD 2,673,927.45 shared with districts (CHAs & OHAs)					
Sample of Additional Contributions from Hunting Operators	4.2 million ETB	2013–2015: \$830,300 USD reported to ANAC from 13 operators	Wages for 767 community game guards (not all funded by hunting) 934 full time and 104 part time employees \$2,433,132 NAD cash value of game meat from hunting	2013–2015: \$1,176,700 USD reported \$3,125,830 reported in Conservation Force audit from 27 companies	Wages for 750 Community Scouts (\$466,236 USD per year) Game meat estimate 129,771 kg per year (>\$600,000 USD in value) distributed	2015: \$525,378 USD from 15 operators
Governing Legislation and Regulations for CBNRM	Wildlife Policy 1997 Proclamation No. 541/2007 – “Development, Conservation and Utilization of Wildlife” Proclamation No. 575/2008 – “Ethiopian Wildlife Development and Conservation Authority” Council of Ministers Regulations No. 163/2008 – “Wildlife Development, Conservation and Utilization” Wildlife Census and Quota for Hunting Directive No. 26/2015	Conservation Law 16/2014 as amended by Conservation Law 5/2017	Nature Conservation Amendment Act No. 5 of 1996 Communal Land Reform Act No. 5 of 2002 Environmental Management Act No. 7 of 2007 National Policy on Human-Wildlife Management of 2009 National Policy on CBNRM of 2013	Wildlife Policy of 1998 (rev. 2007) Forest Policy of 1998 Forest Act of 2002 Wildlife Conservation Act No. 5 of 2009 Wildlife Management Areas Regulation of 2018	Zambia Wildlife Policy of 1998 Statutory Instrument No. 89 of 2004 Zambia Wildlife Act No. 14 of 2015	Policy for Wildlife 1992 Rural District Councils Act of 1988 as amended 2002 Wildlife Policy of 1992 Parks and Wildlife Act of 1996 as amended 2001 Zimbabwe Policy for Wildlife of 2000

	Ethiopia ¹⁻²	Mozambique ³⁻⁴	Namibia ^{5,6,7}	Tanzania ^{8,9,10}	Zambia ^{11,12,13}	Zimbabwe ¹⁴⁻¹⁵
	Revised Hunting Directive No. 31/2016					

DISCUSSION

Hunters highly value wildlife and rural communities, with whom they share a special interdependent relationship. Regulated hunting tourism benefits people living in community-based natural resource management (CBNRM) areas by generating revenues, creating jobs, distributing game meat, and providing voluntary contributions from operators and clients, in addition to development of “multiplier” industries (e.g., taxidermy, transportation). Voluntary contributions from operators and clients include, among other things, construction of schools, donation of school supplies, and payment of school fees; construction and electrification of health clinics and funding for mobile clinic units; construction or rehabilitation of water infrastructure; provision of or funding for drought-relief food supplies; funding and transport for sports teams; support for local governments; and much more. For these reasons, a recent study of communal conservancy residents in Namibia found that “an overwhelming majority (91%) of respondents stated they would not be in favor of a ban on trophy hunting, and only 11% of respondents believe their community would continue to support or strongly support wildlife on communal lands if a ban were in fact enacted.”¹⁶ In other words, 89% of respondents would not support wildlife on their land without the incentives generated from regulated hunting. According to the survey results, “[m]ost respondents strongly agreed that trophy hunting provides benefits to communities and were happy with it taking place on communal lands.” The authors noted: “Results from elsewhere in Africa also suggest that where tangible benefits are received... from hunting, local communities have more favorable attitudes towards wildlife.”

Wildlife benefits from CBNRM programs by increasing the amount of habitat available for populations, reducing poaching through community game scouts or resource monitors, and incentivizing greater tolerance among rural communities. As the U.S. Agency for International Development recognizes, Namibia’s communal conservancies “have contributed to the widespread and well-documented recovery of wildlife in Namibia’s communal lands, particularly in the semi-arid northwest, including rare or endangered species such as elephants, rhinos, and lions.” In Tanzania, “WMAs represent the best hope for conserving wildlife outside of Tanzanian protected areas while enhancing rural economic development... Safari hunting provides a valuable source of revenue for WMAs, especially in areas that are less attractive for photographic tourism. Having an abundance of animals to hunt is a direct benefit of conserving wildlife resources. The more wild animals the WMA manages and conserves, the more revenue it can generate. These are very tangible benefits and linkages that can be easily understood at the community level and are good incentives to

reduce poaching and retaliatory killings of animals such as lions.”¹⁷ In August 2018, Tanzania, through the amendment of the relevant regulations, substantially increased the share of revenue to communities from several tourist hunting-related fees.

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service acknowledges the importance of CBNRM in enhancement findings and other documents. For example: “Conservation programs that generate direct benefits to the local people are often regarded as the only truly effective means to implement lasting conservation measures.” Similarly, Russell Train, past chair and founder of WWF-US, emphasized the importance of CBNRM and the benefits generated by regulated hunting in stating, “elephant hunting provides the most efficient and cost-effective form of producing economic benefits for local people that you can find.”¹⁸

For these reasons, the International Union for Conservation concludes: “[L]egal, well-regulated trophy hunting programs can – and do – play an important role in delivering benefits for both wildlife conservation and for the livelihoods and wellbeing of indigenous and local communities living with wildlife... [W]ell-managed trophy hunting... can and does generate critically needed incentives and revenue for government, private and community landowners to maintain and restore wildlife as a land use and to carry out conservation actions (including anti-poaching interventions). It can return much-needed income, jobs, and other important economic and social benefits to indigenous and local communities in places where these benefits are often scarce. In many parts of the world indigenous and local communities have chosen to use trophy hunting as a strategy for conservation of their wildlife and to improve sustainable livelihoods... Communities benefit from trophy hunting through hunting concession payments or other hunter investments, which typically support improved community services like water infrastructure, schools and health clinics; gaining jobs as guides, game guards, wildlife managers and other hunting-related employment; and gaining access to meat. These are typically poor rural communities with very few alternative sources of income and sometimes no other legal source of meat.”¹⁹

REFERENCES

¹ Ethiopian Wildlife Conservation Authority, Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia. (2020). [Review of the Leopard \(*Panthera pardus*\) quota of Ethiopia, established per Resolution Conf. 10.14 \(Rev. CoP16\) and non-detriment determinations, in accordance with CITES Decision 18.165](#). Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

² Abebe, B.A., Jones, K.W., Solomon, J., Galvin, K., and Evangelista, P. (2020). Examining social equity in community-based conservation programs: A case study of controlled hunting programs in Bale Mountains, Ethiopia. *World Development*, 135. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2020.105066>.

³ National Administration for Conservation Areas, Republic of Mozambique. (2017). Comment on the U.S. Endangered Species Act Review of the Leopard.

⁴ National Administration for Conservation Areas, Republic of Mozambique. (2018). *Review of the Leopard (*Panthera pardus*) quota in Mozambique, established per Resolution Conf. 10.14 (Rev. CoP16) and non-detriment determinations, in accordance with CITES Decision 17.114*. Maputo, Mozambique.

⁵ Namibian Association of CBNRM Support Organizations. (2024). *The state of community conservation in Namibia (Annual Report 2023)*. Ministry of Environment, Forestry and Tourism. Windhoek, Namibia.

⁶ Naidoo, R., Weaver, L.C., Diggle, R.W., Matongo, G., Stuart-Hill, G., and Thouless, C. (2016). Complementary benefits of tourism and hunting to communal conservancies in Namibia. *Conservation Biology*, 30(3). 628–638. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cobi.12643>

-
- ⁷ Goergen, J.D., Lindeque, M., Louis, M.P., Kellner, K.F., Roloff, G.J., and Belant, J.L. (2024). Drivers of hunting and photographic tourism income to communal conservancies in Namibia. *Global Ecology and Conservation*, 56. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geco.2024.e03294>.
- ⁸ Tanzania Wildlife Management Authority, United Republic of Tanzania. (2017). Non-Detriment Findings on African Lion (*Panthera leo*) in Tanzania, including Enhancement Findings.
- ⁹ Community Wildlife Management Areas Consortium. (2016). The Role of Local Communities in Enhancing Wildlife Conservation in Tanzania.
- ¹⁰ Conservation Force (2016). Tanzania Operators Summary Report.
- ¹¹ Department of National Parks and Wildlife, Republic of Zambia. (2018). Non-Detrimental Findings Report for African Leopard Sport Hunting in Zambia.
- ¹² Department of National Parks and Wildlife, Republic of Zambia. (2016). Enhancement and Non-Detriment Findings for African Lion Sport Hunting in Zambia.
- ¹³ White, P.A. and Belant, J.L. (2015). Provisioning of Game Meat to Rural Communities as a Benefit of Sport Hunting in Zambia. *PLoS ONE*. 10(2): e0117237. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0117237>
- ¹⁴ Parks and Wildlife Management Authority, Republic of Zimbabwe. (2016). Enhancement and Non-Detrimental Findings for *Panthera leo* in Zimbabwe.
- ¹⁵ CAMPFIRE Association (2016). The Role of Trophy Hunting of Elephant in Support of the Zimbabwe CAMPFIRE Program.
- ¹⁶ Angula, H.N., Stuart-Hill, G., Ward, D., Matongo, G., Diggle, R.W., Naidoo, R. (2018). Local perceptions of trophy hunting on communal lands in Namibia. *Biological Conservation*. 218, 26–31. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2017.11.033>
- ¹⁷ U.S. Agency for International Development. (2013). Tanzania Wildlife Management Areas Final Evaluation Report.
- ¹⁸ Phillips, M. (1998). African Elephant Conservation Act, 23 Endangered Species Bulletin No. 2–3.
- ¹⁹ International Union for Conservation of Nature. (2016). *Informing decisions on trophy hunting: A Briefing Paper for European Union Decision-makers regarding potential plans for restriction of imports of hunting trophies*.