



"Hunting provides the principal incentive and revenue for conservation.
Hence it is a force for conservation."

World Conservation Force Bulletin

www.conservationforce.org January 2016

SPECIAL SUPPLEMENT

The Measure of Safari Hunting's Positive Impact upon Communities – More than the Media Reports

Today, every hunter needs to know and be able to easily explain the relevance, role and value of hunting as an essential conservation tool. Not simply its benefits, but why hunting is essential or indispensable to the very existence of abundant and at risk wildlife. There is no alternative to hunting, period.



John J. Jackson III

I have discovered that schooled scientists and even seasoned hunters find it difficult to express all that hunting is in terms of conservation. Part of the problem is that hunting is too much to fit under one umbrella in a so-called "elevator statement." Well, Conservation Force should be able to do just that. After all, we are a service organization with a smart name to project that "hunters are the force." We have *smart projects* that demonstrate the unmistakable role and value of hunting (black rhino, Suleiman markhor, Ranching for Restoration, etc.) and partner with exemplary community associations like CAMPFIRE and private organizations like Buby and Save Valley Conservancies, and hunting operators like Robin Hurt, etc.

We have a three-point formula that captures a great deal of the conservation role and value of licensed, regulated hunting. We successfully broadcasted it over and over to millions during the past year. But we all need to build on this formula and make every effort to grow it.

So here it is, in its simplest form. Hunting provides 1) habitat, 2) operating revenue, and 3) stakeholder incentives like nothing else. There is no equal.

Examined a little more closely, licensed, regulated hunting provides wildlife-suitable habitat on which most wildlife exists. Second, it provides the

largest share of operating budget revenue for most wildlife authorities. Importantly, this is the source of most of the revenue for government anti-poaching efforts (which in turn is the first of three levels of anti-poaching – the other two are hunting operators' anti-poaching teams and community game scouts). Third, hunting incentivizes and

motivates those with proprietorship of wildlife to maintain and even increase its condition and abundance. These are local communities (CBNRM: community based natural resource management strategies like the CAMPFIRE Program in Zimbabwe and Wildlife Management Areas in Tanzania), private landholders, communal conservancies (such as Namibia's LIFE Plus Program) and private conservancies (e.g., Buby and Save Valley Conservancies) and other stakeholder arrangements. Successful conservation is all about buy-in from the people who live side-by-side with wildlife.

Take Tanzania, for example. Tanzania's national parks are three times the size of national parks in Kenya. (Obviously Kenya is a poor example of protection.) That is before the mass of hunting land in Tanzania

is considered. The land allocated to hunting in Tanzania is five times the size of Tanzania's national parks. (It is over 300,000 km² compared to approximately 57,000 km² in national parks.)

Tanzania holds Africa's largest populations of both lion and Cape buffalo; more of each than the rest of Africa combined. Most of those exist in the hunting areas, not the smaller national parks -- not that its national parks are small by any other measure than in comparison to the greater hunting areas.

Of course, the wildlife department's operating revenue primarily comes from the hunting. Eighty percent (80%) of that department's anti-poaching revenue comes from hunting. But for the

hunting, most anti-poaching by the government could not exist. Many hunting operators supplement that by operating their own anti-poaching teams. At least one Tanzania operator funded over 2.4 million dollars in anti-poaching in the past three years. Others, such as the Robin Hurt Wildlife Foundation, have community conservation projects dating back 30 years. Communities in

Wildlife Management Areas operate their own anti-poaching teams, also primarily funded by the hunting.

In South Africa, the hunting areas are more associated with private landholders, but there, too, the more than 12,000 ranches are larger than all national parks and hold most of the wildlife. The hunting ranches fund

**Our elevator pitch:
Hunting provides
habitat, operating
revenue and
stakeholder
incentives like
nothing else.
There is no equal.**

themselves. They pay for most wildlife. But for the hunting, most wildlife land, wildlife and related operating revenue, including anti-poaching and the private, proprietary incentives, would cease to exist. The dominant gamekeeping stakeholders are the private landholders. Hunting created those wildlife ranches when it out-competed livestock as the primary land use.

In Namibia, there are two pillars: private ranches and communal conservancies. First, there are the private ranches like in South Africa. Those ranches hold the world's largest populations of cheetah and black-faced impala. The endangered cheetah and black-faced impala would be in dire straits were it not for ranchers (private stakeholders) who are incentivized by hunting to tolerate the species and certainly provide the necessary prey base for cheetah.

The second tier is where Namibia really excels: community conservancies. Communal conservation areas cover close to 20% of Namibia and embrace around 175,000 people. Though smaller than privately owned land, 43% of the country, it is an area larger than national parks, 17% of Namibia's land. This is where a large share of Namibia's elephant (only 7,500 in 1995, around 20,000 today) and black rhino (downlisted from *Critically Endangered* to only *Vulnerable* on the IUCN Red List a decade ago) exists.

The Namibian Association of CBNRM Support Organizations (NACSO), www.nacso.org.na, puts it this way:

A hunting ban would...have a direct impact on at least 48 of the 65 conservancies....Loss of hunting income would result in at least 30 conservancies becoming financially unsustainable...a large percentage of the currently 530

game guards employed...would stand to lose their jobs. Across much of the currently 160,244 square kilometers of community conservation area, wildlife would no longer be considered a land-use priority and would be replaced by other uses such as livestock.

It is clear that hunting secures the most habitat (more than national parks) and generally the most wildlife, is responsible for the conservation structure including most anti-poaching, and fortifies the stakeholder foundation. It is essential and necessary, not just a subjective choice for those of us who hunt. Just as it was the basis of recovery for North American wildlife populations, c o n s e r v a t i o n h u n t i n g i s fundamental to the survival of southern and eastern African wildlife populations.

As hunters, we do not interact only with wildlife. We come to know and bond with the local people too. They are part of the third stakeholder part of the conservation formula. When incentivized through hunting, their proprietorship interest can bloom

into conservation success. Namibia is one of the few instances in Africa where wildlife numbers are increasing in the wild (unfenced areas) and that is because of the proprietorship interest of the landholders-owners.

Conservation Force has created a new chart summarizing community project successes in Africa. It follows this introductory article. The chart will be updated annually and will be available on Conservation Force's website at www.conservationforce.org/news.html. Conservation Force has more in planning, but that will have to wait for a future announcement.

Licensed, regulated hunting is far more than sustainable. What's more, it is more than just beneficial. It is necessary; it is essential. ■

**Licensed,
regulated hunting
is far more than
sustainable.
What's more, it
is more than just
beneficial.
It is necessary or
essential.**



SPECIAL SUPPLEMENT

World Conservation Force Bulletin

EDITOR/WRITER

John J. Jackson, III

PUBLISHER

Barbara Crown

Copyright ©2015 by Dagga Boy Enterprises LLC. ISSN 1052-4746. This bulletin on hunting-related conservation matters is published periodically free of charge for subscribers to The Hunting Report, 12182 SW 128 Street, Miami, FL 33186. All material contained herein is provided by famed wildlife and hunting attorney John J. Jackson, III with whom The Hunting Report has formed a strategic alliance. The purpose of the alliance is to educate the hunting community as well as pro-advocacy of hunting rights opportunities. More broadly, the alliance will also seek to open up new hunting opportunities worldwide and ward off attacks on currently available opportunities. For more information on Conservation Force and/or the services available through Jackson's alliance with The Hunting Report, write:

Conservation Force
3240 South I-10 Service Road West, Suite 200
Metairie, LA 70001
Tel. 504-837-1233 Fax 504-837-1145
www.ConservationForce.org

For reprints of this bulletin or permission to reproduce it and to inquire about other publishing-related matters, write:

The Hunting Report
12182 SW 128 Street
Miami, FL 33186
Tel. 1-800-272-5656 Fax 305-253-5532

*Remember to favor
Conservation Force's Corporate Sponsors:*

FAUNA & FLORA

www.fauna-flora.org



www.hornady.com



ripcordtravelprotection.com

The leaders in their fields.

Community-Based Natural Resource Management Revenue Sharing from Tourist Safari Hunting In 2015

	Namibia	Tanzania	Zambia	Zimbabwe	Mozambique
Title & description of CBNRM program	Namibia Conservancies	Wildlife Management Areas	Game Management Areas	CAMPFIRE Program	Thcuma Tchato, Chepenje Chetu and Niassa CBRNM
Community percentage share of fees	100%	2015 Revenue sharing system (in brackets old percentages): Block Fees: WMA 75% ; TWPF 25% ; DC 0% (No changes) Game Fees: WMA 65% (45%); TWPF 25% ; DC 10% (15%); Treasury 0% (15%) Conservation Fees: WMA 70% (45%); TWPF 25% ; DC 5% (0%); Treasury 0% (30%) Observers Fees: WMA 70% (45%); TWPF 25% ; DC 5% (0%); Treasury 0% (30%) Permit Fees: WMA 70% (15%); TWPF 25% ; DC 5% (0%); Treasury 0% (60%) Tanzania Wildlife Protection Fund (TWPF) District Council (DC)	Shared between ZAWA and the respective communities on a 50/50% basis for trophy fees. Concession fees: 20% to communities 80% to ZAWA	100% of all game fees to program distributed with 55% to wards; 41% to RDC; 4% to CAMPFIRE Association	Niassa : 20% of all trophies and concession fees Thcuma Tchato: 33% of all trophy fees
CBNRM area size	160,244 km ² (about 19,4% of the country)	27,924 km ² (roughly 3% of mainland)	167,000 km ²	50.000 km ² (12,7% of the country)	
Number of inhabitants & beneficiaries of CBNRM	175,000 residents	166 villages inhabited by 480,000 people		777,000 households with 2.4 million children (25% of households in Zimbabwe)	

	Namibia	Tanzania	Zambia	Zimbabwe	Mozambique
Number of CBNRM units (districts, WMAs, conservancies...)	<p>79 registered conservancies</p> <p>1 community conservation association in a national park (Kyaramacan Association, managed like a conservancy)</p> <p>15 concessions in national parks or on other state land held by 20 conservancies (some shared concessions)</p> <p>32 registered community forests</p> <p>66 community rangeland management areas</p>	<p>21 [17 more under development]</p>	<p>36 Game Management Areas (GMAs)</p>	<p>36 Rural District Councils (RDCs) are participating in the CAMPFIRE Programme.</p>	
Other community benefits from tourist safari hunting	Employment, meat	Employment, meat	Employment, meat	Employment, meat	Employment, meat
Gratuitous contributions from operator and hunting clients.	<p>Variable (This includes education, health care, water, transport, and more)</p>	<p>Variable (This includes education, health care, water, transport, and more)</p>	<p>Variable (This includes education, health care, water, transport, and more)</p>	<p>Variable (This includes education, health care, water, transport, and more)</p>	<p>Variable (This includes education, health care, water, transport, and more)</p>

Conservation Force Sponsor

Grand Slam Club/Ovis generously pays all of the costs associated with the publishing of this bulletin. Founded in 1956, Grand Slam Club/Ovis is an organization of hunter/conservationists dedicated to improving wild sheep and goat populations worldwide by contributing to



GRAND SLAM CLUB/OVIS

game and wildlife agencies or other non-profit wildlife conservation organizations. GSCO has agreed to sponsor Conservation Force Bulletin in order to help international hunters keep abreast of hunting-related wildlife news. For more information, please visit www.wildsheep.org.