

AFRICAN INDABA

Volume 2, Issue No 6

e-Newsletter

November 2004

Dedicated to the People and Wildlife of Africa

1 Editor's Comment

Dear Reader,

since I got involved with hunting and conservation policies in Africa and more recently when I took up editing and publishing **African Indaba**, I have been exposed – sometimes rather painfully – at the game of conservation policies in Africa. I have realized – albeit unknowing during all that time – that Robert Kenward (European Sustainable Use Specialist Group ESUSG) expressed something in his August 2004 article *“Incentive-Based Conservation: Moving Forward By Changing The Thinking”*, that I seem to have felt all the time. We need *“to direct more attention towards better conservation (the target) than the process (sustainable use)”*.

Robert Model, current president of the Boone & Crockett Club, said in his Summer 2004 message in the club's magazine *“Fair Chase”* that he *“believes that the more moderate sportsmen and sportswomen, hunters, fishermen and the conservation community can agree to work together to work to achieve [common] objectives*. And he continued to write that we cannot assume to reach absolute agreement from potential allies or they from us. Consensus and principled compromise are mechanisms of achievement in today's pluralistic global society.

Kenward reinforces Model's point by saying that *“protection and extraction organizations also need to cooperate to reduce polarization of public attitudes and hence pressures to over-regularize”*.

The 13th Conference of the Parties (CoP) of CITES during early October presented a perfect example of how principled compromise and networking function. The results of the committee and plenum sessions underline, that positive outcomes for conservation issues can be achieved by being consistent. The combined efforts were not restricted to the months leading up to the CoP, but formed an ongoing process of responsible cooperation between many organizations, individuals and at many levels to avoid what Model called *“extremists at both sides have [tried to] box the debate to one of winner takes all [without] respect of views and lifestyles of others*.

In the immediate aftermath of CoP 13, a hunting organization, SCI (*“First for Hunters”* as the club has labeled itself) took ALL the credit for the CoP-13 rejection of Kenya's Lion Proposal in a boisterous media release. Not one word was lost about the personal, intellectual and financial contributions of other key role-players. SCI's delegation certainly contributed to Kenya withdrawing its proposal, but the emphasis must be on CONTRIBUTION and

certainly not on exclusivity!

The exemplary and comprehensive lion study, commissioned and financed with foresight 3 years ago by the [International Foundation for the Conservation of Wildlife \(IGF\)](#) and [Conservation Force](#) and undertaken by IGF's director, Philippe Chardonnet was the clear focal point of the early resistance against Kenya's uplisting proposal by the African range states. Chardonnet's statistics and citations from his study formed the interlinking thread in virtually all assessments by organizations and individuals who really care about the fate of the African lion. To make it absolutely clear: **ALL opponents to Kenya's proposal** used the Chardonnet study as **THE** convincing argument.

Conservation Force and Dr. Craig Packer of the University of Minnesota – the readers of **African Indaba** know about Packer's work from numerous articles in this e-Newsletter – engaged at a very early time in the discussions where to spend scarce time and funds with the best possible prospects of success in lion conservation and lion hunting. Conservation Force's John Jackson had a lion video produced by Osprey Filming at shortest notice and distributed it with comprehensive literature to wildlife departments in Africa. Jackson, Packer and Chardonnet engaged key decision makers in discussions early in the process and in the process

Continued on Page 2

INSIDE THIS ISSUE

1. Editor's Comments
2. Botswana's Elephants
3. Black Rhino Challenges
4. News From Africa
5. Managing Africa's Elephant Populations: Act Or Let Die
6. Sustainable Use Specialist Group (SUSG)
7. Papers From the 6th Wildlife Symposium in Paris
8. Fundira and “Out Of Africa” Not Off The Hook
9. Scientists Herald Malaria Breakthrough
10. Valuing the Big 5 in Africa
11. Will Kenya Learn From Its Southern Neighbors
12. Indaba Mombasa Recommendations For Kenya
13. Open Letter Of Craig Packer To CITES Delegates
14. Hunting Operations In The Buffer Zone Of The Niassa Reserve
15. A New NRA Initiative
16. National Geographic Germany Apologizes For Tanzania Article
17. Hefty Fine For Illegal Rhino Hunt
18. Highlights From CITES CoP 13

Continued from Page 1
1 Editor's Comment

irrefutable evidence against Kenya's initiative eventually emerged.

Jackson, Chardonnet and Packer, IWMC-World Conservation Trust, and behind the scenes people like Bertrand des Clers, Rolf Baldus, members of the African Lion Working Group, FACE's Manolo Esparrago and particularly the outspoken delegates from virtually all the African range states were the real fathers of the delegates' rejection of Kenya's ill-conceived proposal, which led finally to Kenya withdrawing it altogether in view of certain defeat.

I can say with some pride that **African Indaba** was involved in the process since it started. We corresponded with the African Lion Working Group (ALWG), with the African Large Predator Research Project (ALPRU) and assisted in creating contacts between those who should be partners.

African Indaba brought some controversial articles and opinions to stimulate the discussions. This reasoned discussion was about to be channeled into a comprehensive 2005 symposium "**Towards a Sustainable Future: Lions and Humans in Africa**" (see editor's comments **African Indaba** Vol. 2 No. 5), but the outcomes of CoP 13 overtook these plans and we now have to see how our plans could fit into the workshops projected in the sessions of Committee 1 at CoP 13.

CITES CoP 13 had pragmatic outcomes which set good signals for incentive-based conservation in Africa. These outcomes are not the victory of [some] hunters over the rest of the world (we are far too minute a group of people to ever indulge into such sort of self aggrandizement). These outcomes are proof of reason being stronger than emotions! They are proof that hunter-conservationists, wildlife managers and conservationists can and will work together. Far more important than the rejection of Kenya's lion proposal, than the approval to harvest 5 black rhinos each in South Africa and Namibia, than the increase of leopard quotas in both countries and a number of other sustainable use-linked issues is something else, however:

The plenary of delegates adopted a decision on achieving greater CITES-CBD synergy and a decision on incorporating the **Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines on Sustainable Use** into CITES. This most important development will lead to far-reaching consequences (for details on the Addis Principles and CBD see also **African Indaba**, Vol 2 No 2 – March 2004).

During the forthcoming IUCN World Conservation Congress in Bangkok the IUCN Sustainable Use Specialist Group will elaborate on exactly this topic in two related workshops about the Addis Ababa Principles and in a separate knowledge interchange called "Recreational Hunting and Rural Livelihoods". In another planned workshop in 2005 experts will tackle the growing need to develop a firm intellectual underpinning for the concept that hunting can provide a sustainable tool for conservation and rural development (Jon Hutton, 2004 – see also page 5).

How can the international hunting community have a substantive voice in these processes which undoubtedly influence already now CoP 14 and other international and national conferences and

2 Botswana's Elephants

A synopsis of Patrick van Rensburg's two articles originally published in Mmegi/The Reporter (Gaborone) on August 13, 2004 and August 20, 2004)

***Editor's note:** We bring you a short synopsis of van Rensburg's articles to keep you informed in the current debate about elephant management. The full text is available upon request.*

Botswana elephant population of about 130 000 is the world's highest. Significantly, only about 28% of these elephants are found in national parks. The country boasts of one elephant per every 4.5 square kilometers with a ratio of 1 elephant for 3 people per square kilometer! With about 123 000 of the pachyderms living in the north of the country, the real ratios are somewhat different!

In 1990 there were 55 000 and the official view then – in the 1991 Elephant Management Plan – was to keep their numbers at 60 000! The Department of Wildlife and National Parks (DWNP) currently reviews this plan for the third time. DWNP had no alternative but to acknowledge that it might be expected that affected habitats in the elephant range will become less able to support the elephants themselves - as numbers continue to increase without any apparent moderation of rate while habitats are deteriorating simultaneously. The noble objectives of the 1991 Elephant Management Plan were:

- Manage elephants on a sustainable multiple-use basis in accordance with the 1986 Wildlife Conservation Policy and the 1999 Tourism Policy.
- Maintain elephant populations at their 1990 level by removing annual increment.
- Maintain elephant occupied woodland in acceptable state, subject to climatic influence.
- Reduce elephant populations if research and monitoring indicate unacceptable changes to elephant habitat.
- Maintain biodiversity and essential life support systems in the national parks and game reserves.
- Reduce conflicts between elephants and humans.
- Support and undertake elephant population and elephant habitat research and monitoring programs.
- Seek amendments to the 1989 CITES resolution such that Botswana's elephants will revert to Appendix II

Progress was made in the sustainable multiple use management with the reintroduction of safari and citizen hunting, with low annual quotas. Botswana and other southern African countries succeeded to have their elephants down-listed to CITES App II.

However, woodlands within the elephant range were not maintained in an acceptable state; conflict between elephants and humans continue and the elephant population was allowed to double in 14 years. In 1990, it was generally felt that elephant numbers in Botswana had reached a level at which reduction to a recommended sustainable 60 000 was necessary. With the international public not understanding the issues that result from large elephant populations and the resulting real threat of sanctions if

Continued on Page 10

Continued on Page 3

3 Black Rhino Challenges

By Gerhard R Damm

The black rhino was once a fairly common species for trophy hunters (in the mid-fifties, a general license in Kenya incl. 1 rhino, 2 elephant, 1 lion and leopard each, and a selection of plains game cost about \$1120); it was even routinely shot by game control officers. The onslaught of a terrible poaching endemic in East Africa reduced the numbers so drastically that only the immense experience and dedication of Namibian and South African wildlife authorities saved it from the brink of extinction.

The total number of living black rhinos today is higher than those of the white rhino, when white rhino hunting was re-started. And the white rhino has made a spectacular recovery through "incentive based conservation" – a feat, which can be repeated with its "black" cousin, now after CITES delegates authorized Namibia and South Africa to select 10 male black rhinos for trophy hunting each year. The quotas will become effective in 90 days.

Black rhino hunting in the 21st century will, however, be a very different affair from the rhino hunts during the golden days of African hunting safaris. It will be highly regulated and the animal to be hunted will have been pre-selected by Nature Conservation officials on the basis of parameters like breeding redundancy, aggressiveness against other rhinos, age, etc. The prospective hunter will hunt a particular animal – usually in a finite area demarcated by fences. And these hunts will attract a lot of attention from hunters and non-hunters alike.

With something that exceptional as these rhino hunts, we have an extraordinary opportunity to show to the world that it is thanks to hunters' money that black rhinos will soon be as abundant as the white rhino. I suggest therefore that future black rhino hunts should not be marketed as a catch-as-much-profit-as-possible operation by individual outfitters, professional hunters and/or agents making deals with individual rhino owners.

We rather have to look for innovative ways to ensure that the highest possible economic value is attached to these ten rhino bulls and that the lion's share of the money goes back into conservation of black rhino habitat, reintroduction of black rhino in former ranges, research and management of black rhino as well as into benefit sharing with local communities (i. e. as a motivation to guard rhinos). We should include also – in the instance of South Africa – that private owners must see a powerful economic incentive in reserving land for black rhinos

Instead of leaving the scarce rhino permits for the relative few who will be able to afford the high price tag attached, we should rather think of spreading the chances and at the same time realize an even higher economic result per hunted animal. A series of worldwide raffles (say 500 tickets per bull at \$500 or \$1000 a ticket could do the trick!) will raise substantial amounts! In order to attract the highest numbers of potential raffle ticket buyer, funds need to be channelled through a suitable organization (like Conservation Force) for tax deductibility and minimal administrative deductions. This "Operation Black Rhino" cannot be the exclusivity of one club or association; it needs to be carried by a coalition of hunters' organizations, hunting media, etc worldwide to guarantee maximum exposure and marketing possibilities (see also my

respective thoughts in the editorial column).

Apart from the desire to create the highest economical impact, strict guidelines for black rhino hunting must be defined. Again, this should not be the domain of one organization, but of a coalition. NAPHA and PHASA could cooperate with the national regulatory authorities under the Conservation Force umbrella to define binding guidelines i. e. minimum number of days for a safari, the restricted and exactly defined use of vehicles during the safari, the qualifications of the outfitter and professional hunter, etc.

Conservation Force should also take the lead with the import permitting for US hunters. John Jackson has repeatedly shown that he has the necessary expertise and dedication.

Continued from Page 2
2 Botswana's Elephants

large scale culling was undertaken, no control measures have been taken. Elephants have, as a result, wrought great changes in the landscape, causing a "loss of scenic value, of shade and useful plant species, which are all viewed with concern".

Government policy on utilization of elephants (indeed, all wild life) is that the full potential of the resource should be utilized. If "a meaningful population reduction" was to take place requiring the "removal" of 10 000 elephants a year the DWNP report says it would yield 40 tons of ivory, 8 000 tons of meat, and 650 tons of hide per year. Restrictions on exports (**Editor's note:** ... and external pressure on consumer behavior and social acceptance of elephant products in the first world societies) would "severely limit the values of the products". In the new DWNP elephant policy six key points are now: to minimize human-elephant conflict; maximize elephant populations while ensuring the maintenance of habitats and bio-diversity; manage elephants to the benefit of the national economy; enhance benefits from elephant management to the rural population; meet international obligations; and manage elephants on the basis of sound scientific information!

These aims are as laudable as similar aims were 14 years ago. Now as then the problem will lie in their implementation! Improved public relations, and the need to inform the international public that control of numbers are clearly key issues and the report looks at various means of doing this. They include culling. Its advantages are that large numbers can be removed quickly; it is inexpensive if products can be sold; and, the DWNP says it causes minimal stress to animals if done properly. Culling is, however, "emotionally unappealing", potentially disruptive of tourism; requires large resources of equipment and skilled personnel; expensive and wasteful if there is no market for products; logistically difficult in some areas; dangerous, and can only be undertaken by skilled professionals. Translocation is more humane but hugely expensive. Passive dispersal may have to be "encouraged". Contraception cannot be seriously considered until there is a proven feasible method. Increased safari hunting and citizen hunting would bring in considerable revenue for DWNP and private operators as well as communities, but would not contribute to any herd size reduction

4 News from Africa

Angola

A careless local hunter in Angola's central Bie province was setting a trap when a lion killed and devoured him. According to the source, lions have been seen near Chimbamba, causing fear among the local population. Lions are reportedly seen roaming around the local airfield and the Kalussinga river spring where people fetch water.

Botswana

The Department of Wildlife and National Parks stated that the outbreak of anthrax in the Chobe National Park was subsiding. Assistant Director Jan Broekhuis said that until end September a total of 265 animal carcasses had been found - of which 248 are buffalo and 12 are elephant. The carcasses of one hippo, one lion, one kudu, one impala and one warthog have also been discovered. The number of new carcasses is now significantly down. The carcasses have been disposed of through burning or burying. Only a small portion of the Chobe National Park had been closed to the public because of the anthrax outbreak.

The closed section stretches along the Chobe river front, from the Ngoma entrance gate to the Serondella picnic site and covers an area of 270 km² - 2.7% of the total area of the Park. For management purposes and in the interest of public safety, the closure will remain in force until further notice.

Kenya

A Kenyan Parliamentarian led hundreds of his constituents in invading a 60-acre private ranch in Taita-Taveta District on September 28th. He had ferried the people in lorries to invade Kishushe animal sanctuary, run by Marcus Russell. Armed with machetes, jembes, etc they pulled down beacons and shared the land among themselves. They vowed to kick the ranch owner out, if he did not leave within 2 weeks. "I cannot sit back and watch as my people live as squatters when a foreigner is enjoying a big chunk of land, leased out to him by a few individuals, who are out to serve their own interests," the MP said.

The invasion comes 3 days after another parliamentarian told Taita-Taveta people to invade and take back their land being used as sisal estates, national parks and game reserves. The Parliamentarian said the incident was just the beginning of a wider plan to invade the Tsavo East and West national parks. 62% of Taita-Taveta District is taken up by national parks and game reserves.

Kenya

In Baringo Central the MP asked the residents of Muchongoi to kill marauding elephants. At a time when parts of the country are in the grip of famine, few farmers sit back and watch wildlife, however prized, trample their farms and reduce them to relief seekers. Animals that threaten one's livelihood cause a dilemma between self-preservation and conservation.

In almost all cases where elephants have destroyed crops the people have repeatedly accused KWS of placing the interests of animals above those of the people. They see them not as part of their national heritage, but as devaluers of the quality of life.

Continued on Page 13

5 Managing African Elephant Populations: Act Or Let Die?

Editor's note: *The current elephant debate – and the continued “stakeholders’ consultations (with those participants being most vociferous who have the smallest or no stake to hold) is – in my modest opinion – a waste of taxpayers’ funds. Let me remind you that 21 international experts sat down to discuss the issue more than a year ago. **Just to refresh your memory – here are their conclusions again:***

In several African countries, elephant populations are growing at an alarming rate, as high as 5-10% per annum. Such population expansion is not sustainable and, despite the huge tracts of land open to elephants, it is already having a devastating effect on a number of unique ecosystems and the biodiversity (plant and animal) within them. To avoid an ecological catastrophe culminating in a mass die-off of elephants, urgent action is needed to reduce elephant numbers. Even then, further long-term population control strategies must be implemented if the apocalypse is to be prevented rather than just postponed.

A consultation of twenty-one international experts on the “Control of Wild Elephant Populations” at Utrecht University's Faculty of Veterinary Medicine in Beekbergen, The Netherlands from 7th – 8th November, 2003 came to the following conclusions:

1. In many of the more than 35 African countries that are home to wild elephants, populations are or have historically been endangered by poaching and habitat destruction. However, in several parks where the elephants are well protected, populations are now growing at such a rate that other animal species and plants are being driven to extinction and, due to destruction of the vegetation, a mass die-off of elephant is fast becoming inevitable.
2. The approach to controlling elephant numbers depends primarily on the aim of a given park; i.e. is it primarily an elephant sanctuary or an area dedicated to conserving as great as possible a diversity of species and habitats. If the aim is biodiversity and the elephant population density is already well above the carrying capacity, immediate population reduction is the only answer. Although this could, in theory, be achieved by translocating groups of elephants to new areas, translocation is expensive, time-consuming and logistically complex and, moreover, there are very few areas left to accommodate the large numbers of animals involved. Indeed, in some areas, the numbers of elephants are so large, that the only realistic way of bringing the population under control is culling.
3. Contraceptive techniques have been developed that successfully control population growth in feral horses and are being developed for pest species such as mice and possums. While such anti-fertility treatments are very useful for reducing the rate of population growth in the longer term,

Continued on Page 5

6 Sustainable Use Specialist Group (SUSG)

IUCN holds the 3rd World Conservation Congress (WCC) “People and Nature: making the difference” in Bangkok from November 17th to November 25th. The big talking shop, known as the World Conservation Forum (WCF) will start every day at 7 am and run to 10 pm. The Sustainable Use Specialist Group (SUSG) with Dr John Hutton in the chair has taken responsibility for four events which are scheduled within the WCF program (details at www.iucn.org/congress/programme).

Of particular interest are the following events:

- Presenting the Addis Ababa Principles (AAPG): Sustainable Use of Biodiversity and Human Livelihoods
Nov 18th, 19.30h Room B005, 2 ½ hour sponsored workshop
- Implementing the Addis Ababa Principles for Sustainable Use of Biodiversity: Defining the Road Map
Nov 19th, 17.00h Room B010, 2 hour conservation platform
- Recreational Hunting and Rural Livelihoods
Nov 19th, 12.00h Room RTC2, 2hour knowledge marketplace

The knowledge marketplace on recreational hunting will be done as a sort of round-table for some 15 to 20 people with the objective to prepare for a 2005 symposium to be held in London under the title “**Recreational Hunting: A tool for sustainable conservation and rural livelihoods?**” This symposium will bring together experts in the field and respond to a growing need to address the controversial issue of hunting for recreation and develop a firm intellectual underpinning for the concept that hunting can provide a sustainable tool for conservation and rural development.

“The most vocal supporters of the EIA processes are usually people seeking to preserve ecological bio systems and wildlife habitat first. Only once that is achieved are they prepared to consider whether there are any people who need to be managed to look after these “saved” environs. The human element seems to come last.

I am not cynical about EIAs, I just have a skewed view of their effectiveness when most of the times I hear about them it is from the same advocacy groups conducting campaigns in the media. They seem to forget that most of our poverty-stricken communities can ill afford the time and money to consume newspapers, attend out-of-town meetings, or care about discussing whether or not to eradicate the Indian tahr from the slopes of Table Mountain. The truth is that a hungry stomach does not see the grace in the buck.

Environmental management should not be practiced by environmentalists — it should be the practice of humanists. It should recognize that all people inherently want to live in the best possible condition relative to their social status.”

From: “EIAs for the people” by Donald Kau, 25 August 2004
Mail & Guardian Online

<http://www.mg.co.za/Content/l3.asp?o=135794>

Continued from Page 4

5 Managing African Elephant Populations: Act Or Let Die?

they are certainly not suitable for reducing numbers of a long-lived and late reproducing species, like the elephant, in the short term.

4. Techniques exist to exert reversible or irreversible contraception on male and/or female animals. Indeed, there are already encouraging results from field trials of anti-zona pellucida vaccination of female elephants (a treatment that should block fertilization) and pilot trials have begun with a GnRH vaccine in male elephants (vaccination should block sperm production and suppress sexual behavior in males and prevent follicle development and ovulation in females). Further studies are needed to examine the effects, efficacy, reversibility and in-field practicality of these and other putative contraceptives. Ideally, the bulk of this development will be achieved using in vitro or other-species models, since the 4-year calving interval in elephants means that field trials yield meaningful results only slowly.
5. The way in which the presence and behavior of a dominant bull suppresses reproductive activity in other male elephants and, at least in captivity, can lead to temporary infertility should be investigated. This may lead to novel contraceptive approaches tailored to male elephants.
6. Demographic models need to be developed, using existing and new, targeted field data, to predict the effects of elephant removal and/or contraception on population growth and conservation targets. Field data on the natural factors, such as food resources, that affect population growth will improve the accuracy of these models, which could then be used to identify the best strategy, and the proportion of animals that need to be included, to control a given population.

The expert group makes a call for international political will and financial support to:

7. **Preserve eco-systems in Africa**
 - a) **By protective measures for animals and plants,**
 - b) **By urgent reduction of elephant numbers where needed, through translocation and culling.**
 - c) **By reducing elephant population growth via fertility control**
8. **Study population dynamics in elephants and the factors that affect it, so as to enable reliable modeling of the effects of protective and control measures on population growth, social structure and behavior**
9. **Improve existing and develop novel methods of contraception for the elephant.**

Editor’s note: No more needs to be said – actions are however essential, far more than additional and expensive symposiums!

SUPPORT CONSERVATION FORCE
www.conservationforce.org

7 Papers From The 6th Wildlife Symposium in Paris

The 6th Wildlife Symposium in Paris had participants and contributions from all over the world. Here are the titles of some of the most interesting papers concerning Africa; download the complete list from IGF at <http://www.wildlife-conservation.org/>

- Tourist Hunting and its role in development of wildlife management areas in Tanzania (Baldus, Rolf D)
- Perception et utilisation de la faune sauvage à Kacha-Kacha village à l'est du parc national de Zakouma, Tchad (Bemadjim N'Gakoutou, Etienne)
- Stratégie régionale de gestion de l'activité cynégétique en périphérie de la réserve transfrontalière de biosphère du Parc du W en Benin, Burkina Faso, Niger (Boulet, H. et al)
- Community based natural resource management in Southern Africa and challenges for building robust and effective community institutions: The case for Chivaraidze Community Impala Ranch (Chinoyi, Champion)
- A review of 5 years research on a lion population in Waza National Park, Cameroon (De longh, Hans et al)
- A comprehensive procedure to measure the body dimensions of large African predators (de Waal & Combrinck)
- Designing Strategies to mitigate human-elephant conflict, improve African livelihood and conserve Africa's elephants (Dublin, Holly)
- Coexistence of people and wildlife in a communal area of the Zambezi valley: Presentation of indicators as monitoring tools for sustainable management (Gaidet, Nicolas, et al)
- Can current trends in the South African game industry be reconciled with Nature Conservation (Kas Hamman et al)
- Landowners and the future of conservation (Hopcraft, David)
- Sustainable Use – Concepts, confusion and controversy (Hutton, Jon)
- An individual-based genetic management strategy for game species in South Africa (Kotze, A et al)
- Communal game ranching in the mid-Zambezi valley: Challenges of local empowerment and sustainable game meat production for rural communities (Le Bel, Seb. et al)
- Habitat use and group size of African wild ungulates in a Namibian game ranch (Mattiello, Silvana et al)
- Les zones cynegetiques villageoises: une experience de gestion communautaire des ressources naturelles en Republique Centrafricaine (Mbitikon, Raymond)
- The Conservation Programme of the Western Giant Eland in Senegal (Nezerkova, P et al)
- Refoulement des lions a problemes sortant des aires protégées: experience du parc national du Haut Niger en Rep de Guinee (Oulare, Aboucar)
- Hypermedia as a knowledge management tool in wildlife management (Paterson, Barbara)
- Elephants on game ranches – the South African Experience

(Reilly, Brian et al)

- Chasse Sportive et gestion communautaire de la faune sauvage en Afrique Centrale (Roulet, Pierre-Armand)
- New approaches for involving local communities: The case for CBNRM in Namibia (Skyer, Patricia)
- Potential of wildlife ranching using residual populations outside protected areas in Uganda (Twinomugisha, Bernard)
- Factors that determine the price of game in South Africa (van der Merwe, et al)

8 Fundira And “Out Of Africa” Not Off The Hook

Safari operator Emmanuel Fundira, accused of externalizing more than US\$100 000 from hunting proceeds, was back at the Harare magistrates' court on September 23rd for his routine remand hearing. Fundira, who is out of custody on Z\$10 million bail, appeared before Magistrate Ms Omega Mugumbate. He was further remanded to November 22. Charges against Fundira, who is the chief executive officer of Makuti Game, Safaris and Lodges, arose sometime in 2002 after he allegedly entered into an agreement with Out Of Africa Adventures, a United States company with South African connections. The State is alleging that the agreement stipulated that Out Of Africa Adventures would source clients on behalf of Makuti Game, Safaris and Lodges. These clients would then make advance payment, in foreign currency, to the US-based company, the State further alleges. The company would, in turn, deposit the proceeds into Fundira's accounts the State alleges. Fundira, it is further alleged, failed to repatriate the money amounting to US\$101 388, which were proceeds from hunting and safari facilities offered by his company.

From: “Fundira Further Remanded”, Herald (Harare), 24/09/04

Recently, **African Indaba** has received information that the PHASA membership of “Out of Africa” has been suspended.

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 every two months 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

9 Scientists Herald Malaria Breakthrough

After 50 years of failure, a vaccine against malaria, a disease killing over a million people every year, could be in sight. Human trials carried out on 2,022 children living in southern Mozambique (each person gets an about 38 bites a year from malarial mosquitoes) have shown that it is possible to produce a vaccine that will protect some infants against infection and make the course of the disease less serious and life-threatening in others. Results were published in *The Lancet* medical journal.

Pedro Alonso, University of Barcelona, and the team who carried out the research say that, although the vaccine gave the children only partial protection from disease, the results "show development of an effective vaccine against malaria is feasible". The researchers found that vaccinated children were 30% less likely to have suffered at least one episode of clinical malaria (that needed treatment) by the end of the 6-month trial, compared with unvaccinated children. The vaccine was 45% successful in extending the length of time before children became infected with malaria, and vaccinated children were 58% less likely to develop severe malaria which could kill them.

There was a mixture of excitement and restraint from the scientists involved, who say that the earliest a vaccine could be licensed is 2010. The progress owes much to the malaria vaccine initiative (MVI), which was set up with a grant from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. The MVI promotes public-private partnerships, often in areas that lack profitability, such as supplying medicines to the developing world. The vaccine was discovered by GlaxoSmithKline Biologicals and is one of a number of possible vaccines that have been given financial backing by the MVI. Melinda Moree, the director of the MVI said that "these findings represent a breakthrough in the science of malaria vaccines. They provide convincing evidence that a vaccine could become part of the world's efforts to spare children and families from the devastating effects of this disease."

In a commentary on the latest results, also published in *The Lancet*, Philippe van de Perre and Jean-Pierre Dedet, from the University of Montpellier in France, say there is no reason to think things will now get easier. "The road toward a safe and efficient malaria vaccine being available and usable on a large scale ... will be long and chaotic," they write.

It is fundamentally important to carry on because of the worsening nature of the malaria epidemic. Commonly used drug treatments have become useless in some parts of the world because malaria parasites have developed resistance to them. The HIV/Aids epidemic is also weakening the immune systems of many people in malarial areas, making them less able to fight the disease. "More than ever, infants, young children and pregnant women, who are heavily affected by the direct and indirect consequences of malaria in endemic areas, deserve worldwide scientific, political and financial commitment," the scientists write.

Source: Guardian Unlimited © Guardian Newspapers Ltd 2004

10 Valuing The Big 5 In Africa

By Rael Loon

It is perhaps no coincidence that the Big Five appear on South Africa's currency. Leopard, buffalo, lion, elephant and rhino distinguish our R200, R100, R50, R20 and R10 notes, respectively. These images send a subtle message to all South Africans as well as the rest of the world: our natural heritage as symbolized by the Big Five is a valuable heritage in which we should take pride. But can we quantify how valuable the Big Five are? Should we even try? Most southern African conservationists would say yes, because they believe conservation has to justify itself in economic terms to be able to survive. This is not the only argument for conserving biodiversity: ecological, philosophical, ethical and aesthetic justifications are equally important. But economic arguments can create positive incentives for conservation.

Environmental and resource economists use the concept of "total economic value", which includes both use and non-use values. Use values can be direct or indirect, such as hunting and ecotourism. People's appreciation of wildlife and their willingness to pay to preserve these resources are non-use values. Quantifying such values is not an academic exercise – understanding them can help to guide environmental policies and enable policymakers to prioritize conservation choices and decisions.

The Big One – Elephant

Even though the ivory trade was banned in 1989 by the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (Cites), while the trade was still allowed, elephant ivory could fetch \$200 (about R1 240) per kilogram. The ivory was used to make cutlery, jewelry, billiard balls and piano keys as well as ornaments, with the largest markets for such products being Japan and Hong Kong. Legal trade in non-ivory products produced from culling, such as hides, meat and hair, nets R3,2-million per year. Elephant hides (an average of 80kg per animal) cost about \$12 (R75) per kilogram, for making boots in the United States and handbags and belts in the Far East. Other elephant products include meat, biltong, fat and bone meal.

In his book *At The Hand of Man — Peril and Hope for Africa's Wildlife*, Raymond Bonner traces the history of the highly politicized ivory trade in several African countries and discusses various approaches to elephant management. The debate is between the "idealistic preservationists", who see the ivory trade as corrupt and are vehemently opposed to any use of ivory, and the "pragmatic conservationists", who argue that it is logical to control elephant populations through selective cropping and to trade the resulting ivory to earn much-needed revenue to fund future conservation efforts.

The pragmatic view may sound callous, insensitive to animal welfare concerns about trauma or suffering on the part of the elephants themselves, but it does make economic sense. But can we weigh economic values against the ethical aspects of killing elephants? This intractable dilemma continues to haunt conservation agencies.

Continued on Page 8

Continued from Page 7

10 Valuing The Big Five In Africa

Conservation versus preservation is at the heart of the culling debate. In the Kruger National Park, the ecological carrying capacity of 7 500 animals has been vastly exceeded by over 10 000 animals, because no large-scale culling has been done since pressure from animal welfare groups brought about a moratorium. Although this may have prevented the killing of elephants, it has its costs. Besides preventing the Kruger Park from earning revenue from the sale of tusks to fund ongoing conservation and reserve management, it also has an ecological cost. Large elephant populations can drastically alter the landscape if their numbers are not kept in check.

A decade ago, when preservationists lobbied for and succeeded securing the enforcement of a unilateral ban on trade in ivory products, the result was a decline in elephant poaching in many African countries like Kenya and Tanzania. But, in South Africa, Zimbabwe and Botswana, where policy and management are better controlled, the ban prevents these countries from earning revenue for conservation. Jon Barnes, an environmental economist, has argued that, although the ban on ivory sales had helped slow the species decline in many states, the trade ban was having a negative effect on southern African elephant populations. Hence there was a need to increase the economic value of elephants, without which they would not be protected. David Pearce, a professor of economics and director of the Environmental Economics Centre at University College London, said that, by depriving countries of ivory sales, the ban was the equivalent of a \$50 000 000 (about R310-m) tax on African governments.

Russell Train, former chairman of WWF-US, believes that elephant hunting provides "the most effective and efficient and cost-effective form of providing economic benefits for local people that you can find", as it can yield from \$10 000 to \$16 500 (R62 000-R102 000) per animal. Thus, if 60 elephants per year were hunted in the Kruger National Park (as part of the culling program), this could earn the reserve up to \$1-million (R6 174-m), which could cover the costs of the overall culling program as well as fund other initiatives and research. This year, South Africa considered selling its stockpiles of elephant tusks, which could earn SANParks about R30-million.

The horn of a dilemma – Rhino

Because the ivory market is dictated largely by aesthetic tastes, trade in ivory is more easily enforced because of the stigma attached to purchasing ivory products, which lowers overall demand. Rhino products, conversely, are used mainly as medicines in Far Eastern countries such as China and Taiwan. Despite the protests of African conservationists, this market seems insatiable. The dilemma has prompted several conservationists to find a solution by studying this market in greater detail. They argue that understanding the economics of the rhino trade may help in formulating new conservation strategies. For example, the demand for rhino horn can be said to be "price inelastic", implying that the market is largely affluent people who are unlikely to

Continued on Page 11

11 Will Kenya Learn From Its Southern Neighbors?

A group of Kenyan Members of Parliament who took a 10-day trip to three Southern African countries organized by the East African Wildlife Society (EAWLS) and co-funded by USAid and Safari Club International have faced claims at home that the trip was meant to influence their vote during the forthcoming parliament debate of the Proposed Amendments to the Wildlife (Conservation and Management) Act. The Bill was brought before parliament by the MP for Laikipia West, G. G. Kariuki, and debate on it is set for later in 2004.

Conservationists opposed to the trip claim it was an attempt by game ranchers operating under the auspices of the Kenya Wildlife Working Group (KWWG) to seek the legislators' support for the Bill which seeks to legalize sport hunting in the country. KWWG is an arm of EAWLS, which brings together game ranchers and landholders in Lamu, Nakuru, Machakos and Laikipia districts. The body promotes, among other things, consumptive utilization of wildlife as is evident in a policy proposal it had developed and presented to the Kenya Wildlife Service over a year ago. Some of the provisions in the proposal were incorporated in the Bill now before parliament.

International Fund for Animal Welfare's Regional (Kenya) Director James Isiche said in The East African that the Zimbabwe CAMPFIRE model fell short of meeting the expectations of the communities in Zimbabwe. "Importing conservation policies directly from other countries into Kenya is not the solution to the conservation issues in the country as the model generally used in Southern Africa has failed! (**Editor's Note:** ... and who is questioning IFAW's long standing habit of spreading very significant funds to prevent sustainable use? Let's really make an impartial comparison of conservation successes and failures between Kenya and some southern African countries: I guess Kenya will show a rather poor result, thanks to IFAW's past efforts!)

However, the Kenyan delegation which has been touring Zimbabwe, Namibia and Botswana has praised the conservation and wildlife policies of these countries. Kenya's Assistant Minister of Planning and National Development, Mr. Simeon Lesirma, who lead the delegation, said it had emerged from the tour that an appropriate Wildlife Act should provide legal rights over wildlife utilization in which a multi-use system needs to be adopted.

The Communal Areas Management Program for Indigenous Resources (CAMPFIRE) embarked upon by Zimbabwe demonstrated according to Mr. Lesirma that interest in natural resource management is closely linked to the levels of benefits received at community level. He also called for a regional approach to wildlife conservation since it is largely a transboundary issue. He said the future survival of wildlife depended on the region's ability to contribute to the socio-economic development of producer communities. Mr. Lesirma seemed to be impressed with the strong Gov-

Continued on Page 9

Continued from Page 8

11 Will Kenya Learn From Its Southern Neighbors

ernment-private sector and community partnerships in conservation.

Mr. Lesirma was quoted in the Southern African media for having said that the tour provided an opportunity to establish linkages for networking and collaboration with conservation actors within this region. Of significance is his statement that according to his opinion one of the biggest challenges facing the region in its bid to reform the wild sector was freeing the policy and decision-making process from the influence of foreign-based extremist animal welfare lobby groups whose agenda is contrary to progressive development.

12 Indaba Mombasa Recommendations For Kenya

A **Wildlife Utilization and Management Conference** brought together more than 250 representatives of many sectors of society in **Mombasa/Kenya from 20 to 22 May 2004**.

The Conference tabled the following recommendations:

1. Non-consumptive utilization of fauna consists mainly of game viewing and photography; consumptive utilization includes game cropping, sport hunting, game ranching and farming, as well as the capture, trade and processing of wildlife products.
2. Wildlife utilization, whether non-consumptive or consumptive, is an ethically acceptable conservation tool and a legitimate economic activity.
3. Wildlife utilization should become an unalienable right of the landowner.
4. The guiding principle of utilization must be sustainability, as determined by scientific methods and monitored by scientists provided by the government or by NGOs or private enterprises.
5. Decisions on wildlife utilization in non-protected areas should be made at the District level. To this end, local authorities such as District Wildlife Councils should be created. Whatever the size and composition of these Councils, the majority of their members must be landowners elected by landowners.
6. The District Wildlife Councils may form an association: an umbrella body of a kind allowing them to harmonize their operations.
7. Central Government's role in wildlife utilization should be limited to the creation, and gazetting, of District Wildlife Councils, overall monitoring, the elaboration of guidelines and observance of international obligations.
8. The right to use wildlife carries responsibilities, particularly as regards liability. In sum, wildlife utilization must be beneficial to people and wildlife.

Source: Swara April – June 2004, p.5.

13 Open Letter of Craig Packer to CITES Delegates

The SSN (*Editor's note: SSN = Species Survival Network – an international alliance of animal rights organizations*) document seriously misquotes our paper (Whitman, et al., 2004). SSN implies that our analysis demonstrated that lion hunting would invariably be detrimental to the population as a whole. But we explicitly modeled the effects due to infanticide following the replacement of the breeding males, and we concluded that trophy hunting would have no affect whatsoever on the overall population as long as hunting was restricted to males older than 6 yrs of age.

SSN is simply wrong in stating that we considered current quotas in Tanzania to be unsustainable. Instead, we showed that recent quotas were quite similar to the expected offtake from actual lion populations if our 6 year minimum were adopted. We did say that quotas had recently been raised above these levels, but we did not make any evaluation of their sustainability since we do not know the population sizes in the respective reserves. Indeed, our paper emphasized that quotas would be irrelevant if our age-minimum were adopted.

These distortions are part of a much larger pattern in the SSN document. They imply that the Chardonnet survey is invalid because it has not been peer-reviewed. In fact, the Bauer and van der Merwe paper is in no way a valid scientific survey – it is the result of an informal questionnaire where various researchers simply provided rough guesses of local population sizes. There was no standardized methodology for these guesses, and they vary widely from precise counts of known individuals (our study in Ngorongoro Crater) to sheer speculation. I reluctantly supplied many of the data on Kenya and Tanzania to the Bauer paper myself, and I specifically told the authors that I did not consider my estimates to be more than rough-and-ready approximations – but I felt it was better to provide some sort of rough guess rather than imply (by an absence of any sort of estimate) that there were zero lions in these reserves (which is how the survey would have handled missing data). In fact, the Bauer paper is missing an enormous amount of coverage, so it is obviously a gross underestimate of the continent-wide total.

Thus to state, as the SSN document does, that the Bauer/van der Merwe paper provides some sort of gold standard on lion numbers is ludicrous. Even more absurd is to compare these numbers with even wilder speculations published in the past by Nowell and Jackson or anyone else. These were obviously just order-of-magnitude guesses which were never meant to establish a scientific baseline.

Third, SSN incorrectly states that there are no populations with at least 1000 breeding adults. However, there are at least five populations in Africa that meet this criterion: the Serengeti/Maasai Mara population is estimated to contain around 3,500 lions. We maintain individual records on all the lions living in the south-eastern corner of the Serengeti National Park. Currently, our study population contains 291 individuals and 156 of these (53.6%) are breeding age. Thus the Serengeti likely contains over 1875 breeding

Continued on Page 10

Continued from Page 2

1 Editor's Comment

conventions?

First of all, hunters must recognize that besides of having a common life style and the cherished privilege to know wild creatures and lands of the world through first-hand participatory hunting experience, they also have as important common goals the effective wildlife management and just benefit distribution of their conservation dollar. Last not least hunters [still] have the good will of many scientists, researchers, wildlife managers and conservation organizations! This considerable capital can only be used effectively by pooling our economic, intellectual and political resources and creating vigorous and constant dialogue amongst equal partners. Cooperation and information exchange on basis of equality is essential to achieve common goals and objectives.

National recreational and professional hunting organizations in Africa as well as international hunters' organizations like FACE, IGF, Conservation Force, CIC, SCI and its individual chapters, DSC, HSC, Danish Hunters' Assoc. etc. **need to work together as equals**. We need to show a **combined strong presence and speak with one voice** at all international meetings and reinvent how to cooperate efficiently (i. e. cost-effective and out-comes orientated), in a variety of fields amongst them

- public relations and media work
- hunter & conservation education
- best practices
- field conservation and scientific projects
- hunting regulations at national and supra-national levels
- international conventions CITES, TRAFFIC, CBD, etc
- removal of disincentives for wildlife conservation.

This **HUNTERS' ALLIANCE** must seek responsible outcomes for the wildlife and people of Africa. The real issues must be tackled on global, continental and local levels with strong commitment, sincerity and loyalty. The public – hunting or non-hunting – does not need to be bombarded with statements of individual achievements; these are irrelevant on a global [public] level anyhow. What the public must be made aware of is the simple fact that hunters, irrespective of club affiliation, contribute their share towards the conservation of the Africa's wildlife and its pragmatic "Conservation through Use"!

Hunters in Africa and those around the world interested in Africa must be made to see that the future of African hunting depends on **JOINT ACTION**. We stand or fall together! Let us create something like "**African Wildlife Conservation Partners**" which could blueprint an "**African Plan for Hunting and Conservation**" and arrange innovative schemes for outcomes-focused project funding. No individual organization has the intellectual, personal and/or financial resources to do all that – but as a **HUNTERS' ALLIANCE** we can make a difference! Conservation Force could lead us into this direction! This is – in my opinion – **the real lesson all hunters (and their respective organizations)** have to internalize from CITES CoP 13!

I wish you happy holidays with your family and friends, and a peaceful 2005.

Sincerely,
Gerhard Damm

Continued from Page 9

13 Open Letter Of Craig Packer To CITES Delegates

adults.

The Kruger Park in South Africa is believed to hold comparable numbers of lions, as does the Rungwa/Ruaha/Moyowosi/Kogosi ecosystem in Tanzania and possibly the Okavango ecosystem in Botswana. The Selous ecosystem is believed to contain over 5,000 lions, so there are at least 4 intact lion populations that safely exceed the 1,000 adult lion threshold.

There can be no doubt that the number of lions has declined in Africa since the 1890s. However, the primary cause of declining lion population sizes is problem animal control and habitat loss. Our latest research clearly indicates that the rate of lion killing by local people has increased dramatically in East Africa over the past 5 years. Lions kill on the order of a thousand cattle a year, and we have also discovered that the prior estimate of 50-60 people killed by man-eaters each year is seriously underestimated. We now believe that about 100 rural Tanzanians are killed by lions every year. Consequently, the local people express a tremendous amount of hostility towards lions. Whenever a lion is killed in retaliation for taking livestock, the villagers celebrate with a feast – and the lion killers are hailed as heroes.

A ban on international trade will not make any positive impact on the attitudes of local people toward dangerous animals. Nor have any of the proponents of a hunting ban offered any alternative mechanism for either enforcing anti-poaching activities or protecting rural populations from further lion attacks. Any further loss of incentive for tolerating lions would be catastrophic.

It is very important to remember history. When the parks systems were established in Africa during the colonial era, only a small proportion of wildlife areas were given full protection as National Parks. In countries like Tanzania, a much larger amount of land was set aside as buffer zones around the parks. These buffer zones were intended to create a gradient around the parks to protect people from the animals in the national parks, and to protect the animals in the national parks from people in the agricultural areas. Lions were always considered to be a highly dangerous resident in the parks, and the buffer zones were meant to establish the safe gradient by allowing trophy hunting and other forms of utilization.

If lion hunting is banned, this system will be lost. Local people are already killing far more lions than trophy hunters. Remove the enforcement agencies that protect lions in the reserves and lions will be gone in another 10-20 yrs.

I find it incredibly ironic that this initiative has come from Kenya, where all forms of trophy hunting was banned in the 1970s. Kenya has suffered a devastating loss of lions over the past 30 years, including the lions in Amboseli and Nairobi Parks owing to hostility of local people to dangerous predators.

The experiment has already been performed, and the answer is clear. Lions must be managed in cooperation with trophy hunters, wildlife biologists and conservationists. The task ahead is formidable; we need all the help we can get.

Craig Packer
Distinguished McKnight University Professor

Continued from Page 9

10 Valuing The Big Five In Africa

change their behavior and are willing to pay high prices. So a ban would be ineffective and could drive this market underground.

What would be the economic feasibility of harvesting rhino horn sustainably, should the CITES ban ever be lifted? One factor would be the market value of the horn, which can vary from R4 000 to R30 000 per kilogram. By weighing these economic indicators against rhino population data, the total value of a (hypothetical) white rhino horn industry on private land in South Africa was valued, in 1997, at between R14-million and R195-million. Today, it has probably doubled. These values exclude the value of existing stockpiles of horn and the auction value of live animals, both of which are substantial.

White rhino have been moved from App I to App II of CITES, allowing for limited trade in rhino horn, which has expanded the legal market. Although CITES officials are not unanimously in favor of a controlled legal trade in rhino horn, a growing number of South African conservationists advocate sustainable trade in rhino horn, including the selling of stockpiles to earn revenue.

This group argues that, as white rhino are no longer endangered and have, in fact, recovered considerably in certain areas, controlled trade can be justified, especially if the revenue is used to conserve the much more endangered black rhino. At first glance, this approach sounds callous, but the reality and severity of the situation may force conservationists to adopt unpopular policies simply to ensure the survival of conservation efforts. They argue that, by strengthening property rights in natural resources such as rhino, and by increasing their market value, incentives to conserve will also be created.

So, what's the price tag on a (live) rhino? Recent auction figures for white rhinos would set you back an average of R192,000 per animal. The record price to date is R450,000. For the rarer black rhino, prices range from R450,000 to R602,000. Factor in trophy hunting, and you get up to \$50,000 (about R300,000).

Buffalo, Lion and Leopard

Although nowhere near as expensive as elephant and rhino, the other three don't come cheap either. Average auction prices for buffalo, in 2003, were around R120 000 per head, with record prices of up to R225 000. But current veterinary regulations do not allow for Kruger buffalo to be moved elsewhere in the country, which limits the full realization of their value. Lions currently sell for an average of R23 000, preserved skins for up to R100 000, while, in exceptional cases, hunting trophy animals can realize as much as R230 000.

South Africa is allowed to export 75 leopard trophies per year (*Editor's Note: Pre CITES CoP 13*), each of which can be worth between R45 000 and R80 000 to a landowner on whose farm a leopard is hunted. But, as Luke Hunter and Guy Balme point out in a study of the leopards in the Phinda Reserve of Kwazulu-Natal, the accumulated total that tourists will pay to view a leopard over its lifetime far exceeds the one-off profit made from shooting one.

Continued on Page 12

14 Hunting Operations In The Buffer Zone Of The Niassa Reserve

SRN - Sociedade para a Gestão e Desenvolvimento da Reserva do Niassa¹

2003 was the first year in which all hunting blocks in the Buffer Zone of the Niassa Reserve conducted hunting safari operations. Considering that the hunting operations are still in an initial development stage, it is premature to make definitive conclusions, however it can be stated that the Buffer Zone of the Niassa Reserve has definitely entered the safari market.

[Sociedade para a Gestão e Desenvolvimento da Reserva do Niassa](#) (SGDRN) developed a set of policies for sustainable consumptive wildlife use in these hunting blocks. The primary objectives of SGDRN focused on attracting safari operators (hunting outfitters) with a financial capacity to invest and support an initial development period of non-profitable operations and with social abilities to work with the local communities. SGDRN further targeted the select clientele of international trophy hunters willing to pay a high amount for a quality experience and planned to manage a conservative quota for maximum hunter days with a minimum of high quality hunted animals.

For the 2003 season a total hunting quota of 567 (100% - value US\$ 75,000) animals was approved of which 291 (51% - value US\$ 45,000) tags were sold and 249 (44%) of these were actually used. Within the 2003 season the safari operators conducted 30 guided safaris for international clients (30 hunters; 15 observers - nationalities: 19 USA, 18 Spain, 7 Portugal, and 1 Australia). A total of 388 paid hunting days was spent in the field with average safari duration of 13 days. There are 8 camps in the blocks with an accommodation capacity of 4 to 9 clients. They consist of tents and/or local constructions with local materials. The hunting companies employed in 2003 hunting season 246 workers of which 117 were permanent (including 48 game scouts) and 129 seasonal. About 900 km of picadas (bush tracks) and 8 landing strips complete the infrastructure created in the last 3 years for the development of safari activities in the Buffer Zone of the Niassa Reserve.

Despite of the conservative quotas, no safari operator has yet reached its maximum efficiency in the number of safaris/hunter days related to assigned quota or in the desirable mix of trophy animals per safari. Experience from the first full season has also shown that 21-day safaris (i. e. lion/leopard, lion/buffalo, etc) often result in less revenue to the State due despite of higher daily rates, due to the fact that fewer animals are harvested, since the hunters concentrate on their primary trophies.

The report indicates sable antelope is considered the highest density species in Niassa Reserve; whereas this species seems to be scarce in Block A, the concession holder of Block C reported good trophy quality and abundance. 56% of the approved sable

Continued on Page 12

Continued from Page 11
 10 Valuing The Big Five In Africa

The Big Five and Ecotourism

The value of the Big Five can also be deduced from the investment needed for the protected areas that support them, whether state-owned or in private hands. National Big Five parks include Kruger, Addo, Augrabies, Mapungubwe and Kgalagadi, St Lucia, Hluhluwe-Umfolozi and Mkuze. Private game reserves include Sabi Sands, Timbavati, Klaserie, Manyeleti and Umbabat.

Ecotourism is often touted as the only viable way to earn revenue to justify the conservation of a particular area and thus prevent its conversion to agriculture, human settlement or other form of land use. Ecotourism is therefore regarded as one of conservation's major economic engines.

Ezemvelo Kwazulu-Natal Wildlife manages 415 000 hectares of conserved land. To get an idea of its worth, private Big Five real estate is valued at between R2 000 to R4 000 per hectare. A recent World Bank report shows that, on a macro scale, ecotourism accounts for 21% or R415-million of the gross geographic product (GGP) of the north-eastern Zululand economy and supplies 7 000 jobs. Ecotourism's contribution to overall provincial GGP is R545-million.

SANParks has set up a new system of private concessions within Kruger Park. In a recent article, the Financial Mail stated that capital investments to date exceed R216-million. SANParks anticipates a 20-year income of up to R403-million. Some lodges in the 60 000ha Sabi Sands game reserve have been operating for over 25 years. As a result, game has become habituated to the presence of humans, allowing exceptionally close encounters from open landrovers. For this reason, tourists to Sabi Sands are willing to pay high tariffs. Because of this, the value of the land has increased considerably, up to 700%.

Neighboring Kruger Park comprises two million hectares and is regarded as an ecological jewel. Mike t'Sas-Rolfes, a resource economist, pointed out in 1994 that, even if Kruger were valued at less than a third of Sabi's value, it would be worth as much as R20-billion, making SANParks one of the 25 wealthiest corporations in the country. Even at a more realistic valuation of R4-billion, Kruger would rank among the top 100. These astronomical values do not imply that wildlife reserves all operate at a profit. In fact, for many, the reverse is true. Investing huge sums of capital in ecotourism and conservation areas can be a risky business, with high operating costs, compounded by the competitive nature of the ecotourism industry and the current uncertainty of the market.

Making wildlife work

An indirect reflection of value is job creation, especially for impoverished rural communities close to protected areas. The Kruger Park alone employs over 3 000 permanent staff, while the new concessions have created an additional 700 jobs. Creating value for local communities is a major challenge in conservation, one that is compounded by population growth and poverty, which can place increased pressure on protected areas. Integrated con-

Continued from Page 11
 14 Hunting Operations In The Buffer Zone Of The Niassa Reserve

quota was actually harvested. SGDRN's comment for the other areas was inconclusive regarding this species and did not elaborate whether the reason behind low sable quota use was scarcity, poor trophy quality or low demand (**Editor's note: we will request SGDRN to give more details on this high value species**).

Buffalo are hunted in relatively small numbers – with a used quota of 16 buffalo in 2003, which is only 40% of the approved quota (**Editor's note: although there is a high international demand for buffalo safaris**) and SGDRN's research confirms a scarcity of buffalo especially in the hunting blocks located in the western side of the reserve (**Editor's note: it may also be connected with the relative physical difficulty of hunting buffalo in certain areas**).

Lion and leopard are presently the main draw cards for the operators; whereas leopard hunts (18 leopard harvested in 2003 equal 82% of the approved quota) seem to pose no problem, lion are not easy obtainable, although most operators insist on the abundance of lions, however with the proviso that "trophy size is not always the best"! The reported hunting success for lion (11 lion harvested in 2003 equals 79% of the approved quota) could be an indication of the high effort to hunt a lion. Some hunting blocks did not use the total lion quota. One may conclude that a smaller number of lions than that initially assumed exist in the hunting areas. (**Editor's note: Lion safaris give Niassa Reserve comparative advantages for marketing safari hunting; there seems to be a necessity for more research into the sustainability and a conservative approach of/to lion hunting**).

Of the remaining species offered for hunting in the blocks, only waterbuck, Lichtenstein's hartebeest, and wildebeest seem to be of greater interest to the visiting hunter, whereas other species like bushbuck, reedbuck, kudu, zebra, etc seem to be taken only on incidental basis. SGDRN caution however regarding the possibility of low wildebeest numbers on the west side of the reserve. Impala, although mentioned in SGDRN's report most likely does not draw international hunters to Mozambique and quota utilization is low (**Editor's note: there is room to look at alternative approaches for impala utilization: considering the need for meat for the local communities, safari operators could initiate a culling program with meat distribution – CIRAD Zimbabwe has the experience to assist in planning**).

SGDRN's comments regarding the individual hunting blocks are of interest although SGDRN unfortunately does not give individual quotas per species and individual block quota usage. According to the report, block A was abandoned for several years with a high poaching rate and subsequent low animal density. Only in 2003 did hunting resume in block A, and that seemed to have been feasible only since A was used as complimentary area and in conjunction with block C. Blocks A and C are operated by Lugenda Wildlife Reserve (Tel: 258-1-301618, Fax: 258-1-301625).

Some hunting outfitters – like Johan Calitz Safaris (Block D1 –

Continued on Page 13

Continued on Page 14

Continued from Page 12
10 Valuing The Big Five In Africa

servation and development projects for the benefit of communities living adjacent to reserves are critical to ensuring the continued existence of reserves.

Pricing a priceless legacy

Beyond the economic value of wildlife, as represented by the Big Five, there are intangible, or "non-use", values to be derived from the mere fact that wildlife exists. For many South Africans, wherever we live, and whether or not we ever visit wildlife reserves, just knowing, for instance, that our population of black rhino has recovered to healthier levels because of conservation efforts is a source of national pride. For those of us who visit parks, there is an indescribable thrill about seeing a pride of lions around a giraffe kill, or a pair of leopards mating, or the majesty of a herd of elephants. Should we factor in these intangible "existence" values? Is it even possible to measure the value our society as a whole places on ensuring the continuing existence of wildlife populations?

Conservationists and policy-makers hold conflicting views about whether these intangible values should be used alongside other methods of quantifying the value of environmental resources, whether they have any place in cost-benefit analyses. Some argue that trying to assess intangible values is too subjective to be a consistent yardstick and, by trying to incorporate them, one would have to consider an endless list of other social values as well. Others argue that existence values are expressed in the form of donations towards the conservation of a particular resource, that one can use this to measure to what extent people are willing to pay for conservation and hence the level of intangible existence values. By incorporating such non-use values in decision-making, a better reflection of the true value of a particular resource is obtained.

It is a complex argument and perhaps the Big Five should not be the only species we use to promote the conservation of biodiversity — but, nevertheless, by raising the total economic value of these flagship species and the protected areas that support them, they protect the myriad of other species within these areas: insects, small mammals, birds, amphibians, reptiles, and hence South Africa's biodiversity.

First published on 18 August 2004 by Mail & Guardian Online (<http://www.mg.co.za/Content/13.asp?o=135663>)
 Reprinted with the author's kind permission

The African Lion Working Group has appointed Philippe Chardonnet and John Jackson III as members of this elite group of lion experts. African Indaba extends congratulations to both!

Continued from Page 4
4 News From Africa

Mozambique

A herd of 50 buffalos has been imported into Mozambique's Limpopo NP as part of an ambitious restocking program.

So far, about 3,000 animals of various species have been imported by the park since 2002. This is around half of the 6,000 targeted by the program. Gilberto Vicente of the park management said that the buffaloes were brought into the country after going through all veterinary procedures to ensure that they are not suffering from any disease. Vicente explained that bringing in buffaloes is a pilot experience to try and ensure ecological balance. Buffaloes play an important role because they eat high grass, and open up areas for other herbivores to graze.

The Limpopo NP is part of the Greater Limpopo Transfrontier Park, which also includes South Africa's Kruger Park, and the Gonorezhou Park in Zimbabwe.

Namibia

Environment and Tourism officials have cordoned off part of the Caprivi Region where some wild animals died after contracting anthrax recently. The MET's Deputy Director for Parks and Wildlife Management, Sacky Namugongo said that the cordoning off was done to limit the movement of the animals. The area in which anthrax mortalities were reported, borders the Chobe National Park in Botswana. 11 elephants and buffaloes died of anthrax in the area. Dr F Joubert, the Acting Deputy Director for Animal Disease Control stated that 9 cattle had died of the disease in the meantime.

Joubert said as a protective measure, the Ministry was now vaccinating all cattle in the surrounding areas. It is believed that anthrax spilled over to Namibia from Chobe.

Namibia

Traditional leaders and community members of the Berseba constituency in the Karas Region gathered for a three-day conservancy education workshop to provide a broader perspective and understanding of the conservancy concept. The workshop was conducted by the Namibian Development Trust (NDT), in conjunction with the Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET). NDT Regional Program Director, Ulrich Davids, said that the application for registering the conservancy would be submitted within 3 months.

Davids urged the community not to see the conservancy idea as a "stumbling block", but rather as a move to take ownership by managing the natural resources of the region.

Namibia

The 2002 hunting statistics show that the country hosted 4,815 tourist hunters from 42 countries. Germans had the lead with 1,900 visitors, followed by the USA with 649, Austria with 516 and France with 361.

The tourist hunters took 18,058 trophy animals, amongst them 3,380 oryx or gemsbok, 2,648 kudu, 2,597 warthog, 2,216 springbok, 22 buffalo, 98 leopard, 72 cheetah, 57 elephant, 7 lion and 2 white rhino.

Continued on Page 15

Continued from Page 12

14 Hunting Operations In The Buffer Zone Of The Niassa Reserve

Tel: 27-56-2131633) and Graeme Pollock's Safari s Mozambique Bound (Block D2 – Tel: 267-686-3055) – are reported to use the Niassa blocks as complimentary areas to their concessions in other countries (Botswana) especially for lion and sable, since these species are not on quota in Botswana. Block E is operated by Niassa Hunter Safaris (Tel: 27-82-71849), Block B by Kama-baco Investimentos (Tel: 258-1-401470).

According to SGDRN's report the safari operators in the Niassa Reserve are still far from reaching a stable position in the international safari market and their competitive position in the international markets is still fragile. Client portfolios of the current operators are not always composed of the most desirable hunting clients – those dedicated trophy hunters willing to pay more and only looking to hunt mature trophies.

There are a number of other constraining factors. Hunters meeting vehicles and people within the hunting areas are contrary to client expectations of a "wild Africa" safari. The excessive presence of tsetse flies makes life uncomfortable (although the fly presence is a beneficial factor for wildlife). Camp workers are generally hired locally. It is frequent for them to abandon their work posts to visit relatives, or bring their families to their work place. There are 12 outposts in the hunting blocks – usually close to campsites; it is, however, difficult to keep the game scouts on posts without constant supervision. It is problematic to find staff with any degree of training. On the other hand, the training activity offered by the safari operators is small or non-existent. Transport to and from the hunting area is difficult due to constant flight changes by LAM and the fact the Lichinga airport is not an international airport.

Of greater concern however seem to be the existing tolerance on a local government level with regard to poaching and the lack of clarity regarding the rights and obligations of the hunting concessionaires. Based on the information collected by SGDRN, poaching for commercial exploitation (the main market is in Tanzania), with fire weapons and using traps and trap lines, the uncontrolled circulation of weapons, especially in the West part of the Reserve, the fishing practices with inadequate methods and especially forest fires are of concern. In general there seems to be a distinct sentiment that the institutional attitude towards foreign investors and tourists is still far from satisfying.

Information on the subject of revenue earned by safari operators does not allow for a reliable evaluation of the economic results of the different operators according to the SGDRN report. The knowledge on operational costs is also poor. Indicative figures show that the daily rates charged by each operator and safari type vary from US\$555 to US\$750 and US\$1,020 USD. Operators also have a diverse price structure for hunted animals. For the more important trophies the selling prices to clients range from a minimum of 300% to a maximum of 2,300% of the government fees. A comparison between blocks indicate that some blocks have been more successful in their efforts to add value to the

Continued on Page 16

15 A New NRA Initiative

The **National Rifle Association NRA** is by far the largest hunters' organization in the world. It has more than **two million hunters as members** and has long been on the front line in protecting hunters' interests, much more so than it is given credit. Now the NRA has really stepped up its involvement to save hunting. It has formed a new program to *proactively* assume a greater and more important role in protecting hunters' interests with **FREE HUNTERS, The National Hunting Club of America**.

The cost of membership is only US\$15.00 for NRA members and US\$19.85 for non-NRA members. Life membership costs US\$495.00. Anyone can become a member by calling 1-866-357-4868 (HUNT). For more information please check the website at www.FreeHunters.org.

Members receive a magazine, **Free Hunters**. The first issue was published in September 2004. **Conservation Force's** John Jackson III along with Don Causey of **The Hunting Report** and other key people have been working on this development for several years. It began with meetings between NRA's Wayne LaPierre, Causey and Jackson after *Fortune Magazine* cited the NRA as the most influential lobby in the world. The NRA is an uncompromising political advocate. Its new, more focused dedication to saving hunting is wonderful news.

Initially, the NRA promises to

- (1) push for more public hunting land for the average hunter,
- (2) reduce bureaucratic red tape of State and Federal agencies regarding hunting, and
- (3) promote passage of right-to-hunt constitutional amendments in all 50 US American states.

It can and will give hunters representation that they have never had except in token form. Its focus on the bureaucratic red tape piling on from Federal and State agencies is a worthy niche, as the regulatory maze grows more complex each season and little is being done about it.

16 National Geographic Germany Apologizes for Tanzania Article

National Geographic made a full page apology with regard to its July 2004 article about the elephant hunts of the Tanzanian Barabaig. Readers had found out that NG photo-journalist Gilles Nicolet used a number of "engineered" photos to illustrate the article. Nicolet had borrowed the elephant tusks, allegedly coming from the Barabaig's elephant hunting, and transported them into the Barabaig hunting grounds. The photos which allegedly showed elephants killed by Barabaig spears and lances had been taken by Nicolet years before in Cameroon.

The NG editors stated "we broke our unwritten contract with respect to the veracity which you expect from National Geographic".

Continued from Page 12
4 News From Africa

South Africa

The annual meeting of IUCN Southern Africa Sustainable Use Specialist Group (SASUSG) was held at Addo Elephant NP in May with participants from Southern and Eastern African countries, incl. governmental, academic, NGO and private sector institutions. SASUSG members presented papers on a number of topical themes.

For more information about SASUSG please contact the chair, Brian Child at BChild@dsi.org.zm

South Africa

... and the battle continues between the Eastern Cape and KwaZulu-Natal about who has of the largest kudu. Gregor Woods of Man-Magnum (November 2004) is still convinced that his home province has the upper hand. Gregor compares what he calls an outstanding Eastern Cape Kudu measuring 56 ½ inches with a very average (in Gregor's views) Natal bull measuring 61 inches. Gregor is sure that bigger Natal bulls will be forthcoming soon!

He may have a problem though when traveling through settler country next time!

17 Hefty Fine For Illegal Rhino Hunt

Geffert Pretorius, co-owner of the Nonile hunting concession, was convicted by the Durban Magistrate's Court on six counts of fraud, attempted fraud, theft and contravening the KwaZulu Natal Nature Conservation Ordinance and fined R540,000 (US\$ 86,000) and sentenced to five years' jail for allowing a client to shoot a rhino in November 2000 which did not belong to Pretorius.

All of Pretorius' hunting licenses were revoked for three years and he was ordered to pay R125,000 each to the two co-owners of the rhino (South African Tim Rudman and American Eric Skrmetta), plus R10,000 each for covering their traveling expenses, as well as R200,000 to the German client who had paid Pretorius R190,000 to shoot the rhino.

Pretorius was found guilty of hunting specially protected game without a license and was fined for that R40,000 or two years' jail and of selling specially protected game products without a license for which he got a further two years' jail, suspended for five years. Pretorius was further convicted on a further three counts of failing to ensure that his client hunted legally, for failing to complete the required registration permit and failing to enter into a written contract with his client and fined another R30,000 or 36 months in jail. As consolation for the unsuspecting German client, the lion trophy will probably be returned to him, since he was unaware that he had shot the rhino illegally.

KZN Wildlife Ezemvelo conducted the investigation that led to the court case and its satisfying outcome. PHASA commended Ezemvelo for its actions and signaled satisfaction with regard to the sentence handed down by the court.

18 CITES CoP 13 Highlights

Governments attending the 13th CoP agreed overwhelmingly to improve links with the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). This will give a major boost to opportunities for synergy in the implementation of the world's two main international agreements that address conservation and use of wildlife resources. Their decision followed consideration of the report of an April 2004 expert's workshop on CITES-CBD synergy convened by TRAFFIC, IUCN, Flora & Fauna International, the German Federal Agency for Nature Conservation (BfN), and the German Agency for Technical Co-operation (GTZ). CITES member governments agreed that the workshop's findings and recommendations on sustainable use, applying the ecosystem approach, access and benefit sharing and other issues should be considered in revising the CITES Strategic Vision and Action Plan and future work programs of the CITES and CBD Secretariats. Specific progress was made with regard to bringing the CBD Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines for Sustainable Use of Biodiversity to the attention of CITES authorities and encouraging their use. The Principle and Guidelines were adopted by the Parties to the CBD at their seventh meeting, earlier this year, following a several year development and consultation process strongly supported by IUCN. Acting on a proposal put forward by Namibia, CITES Parties agreed that the Principles and Guidelines should be circulated to CITES authorities and taken into consideration when establishing export levels for CITES-listed species. Other actions recommended included greater sharing of information on sustainable use at the national level and participation of CITES agency staff in CBD technical meetings

Leopard: Namibia proposed to increase its annual export quota from 100 to 250 specimens for leopard hunting trophies and skins. EU, USA, Qatar, Botswana, South Africa, Uganda, Japan, IWMC-World Conservation Trust and others supported the proposal, while India opposed, stressing the need for a precautionary approach and better international trade regulations. Fund for Animals opposed the proposal, noting its failure to include the number of specimens shot as a result of conflicts with human activity or by illegal hunting. South Africa proposed to increase the export quota for leopard from 75 to 150 specimens. India opposed, while USA, EU, Eritrea, Chile, Malaysia, Nigeria and others were supportive. Cameroon recommended collaborating with Namibia to improve monitoring. Born Free Foundation and Fund for Animals opposed, noting unsustainability and lack of adequate scientific data. TRAFFIC was supportive, but suggested South Africa re-evaluates its internal tracking system. **The proposals were approved.**

Black rhinoceros: Namibia proposed to grant an export quota of black rhinoceros hunting trophies, noting an increase in black rhinoceros populations in Namibia. The EU said the capture should be restricted to five adult males and that trophies should be marked. Benin, South Africa, Japan, Zimbabwe, Tanzania, Cameroon and others supported the proposal, while Kenya, India

Continued on Page 16

Continued from Page 14

14 Hunting Operations In The Buffer Zone Of The Niassa Reserve

species that construe the comparative advantages of Niassa Reserve in the safari market place, such as lion, sable, wildebeest, hippo and crocodile. At least in some cases operators have a significant profit margin in trophy fees, which, as SGDRN reports, assists in covering costs and in some cases provides small profit margins for the companies. The total direct added value from hunting operations in the five hunting blocks is estimated to stand at slightly more than half a million US-Dollars for 2003, although this estimate is partially based on certain assumptions.

Nevertheless SGDRN concluded that operators still have some space for maneuver and it is in their hands to improve the performance of the Blocks as regards hunter days, more efficient quota use and revenue.

The pressing concerns for the game management in the Niassa Reserve are the quantity but the composition of the quota assigned to operators and the difficulties registered in relation to obtaining some of the offered trophy species like buffalo and lion. It is essential that existing data are substantiated by field research and a cooperative, honest attitude from the safari operators. This will be of essential importance for the future of lion hunting in the area. Even more so, when bull elephant will be on future quotas; SGDRN is already in advanced discussions with experts and safari operators regarding elephant hunting rules adequate to the Niassa Reserve conditions.

Based on the consultancy by Vernon Booth in 2002, on the data of this SGDRN report and in Derek de la Harpe's consultancy on the perspectives for the development of Tourism within the Reserve, SGDRN will have to propose a set of possible scenarios in relation to which it is important to make decisions that will impact on 2005 hunting season. Whatever the scenarios discussed, these will necessarily have implications in relation to the zoning of the Reserve and in the areas for consumptive and non-consumptive use and in the hunting quotas authorized by CITES.

African Indaba will continue to keep you informed about the developments in and around the Niassa Reserve.

For more information about wildlife numbers and distribution see 2002 Aerial Report at <http://www.niassa.com>

Postscript:

Chardonnet (2002) puts the lion population of the entire Niassa ecosystem at 500 with a minimum of 350 and a maximum of 650. Jeremy Anderson comes to a considerably lower estimate with 150 (pers. comm. 2004). Funston (pers comm. 2001) estimates the Niassa lion population at +/- 500

For the entire country of Mozambique Chardonnet estimates 995 lion with 668 (min) and 1242 (max). Anderson puts the total number of lion considerably lower between 300 and 400; Funston estimates around +/- 750. In a press release dated 16 July 2004 the SADC Secretariat stated a lion population of 1500 for Mozambique. .

(Editor)

Continued from Page 15

18 CITES CoP 13 Highlights

and Save Foundation of Australia opposed. Chad, Nepal, Nigeria, Central African Republic, Pakistan and Born Free Foundation expressed reservations, and recommended more time to set up monitoring systems. South Africa presented its proposal for a hunting quota of five adult male black rhinoceroses. China, EU, Qatar, Japan, Swaziland, Mali, Zambia and others supported the proposal; India and Kenya opposed. Mali, Nigeria and Central African Republic proposed to South Africa to translocate the designated five black rhinos to former range States. Questioning how future revenues will benefit conservation and local communities, WWF and TRAFFIC called for reconsidering the proposal at COP-14. Born Free Foundation questioned whether trophy hunting is the only way to raise revenue. Save Foundation of Australia said allowing for hunting quotas could increase poaching. **The proposals were approved with the recommended amendments.** In the plenary Chad asked to reconsider the two Black Rhino quotas with Mali seconding. Qatar and Netherlands (speaking on behalf of the 25 EU members) opposed the reopening of the debate. (14 voted to reopen, 89 voted not to reopen, 24 abstained)

African lion: Kenya **withdrew its proposal** to transfer *panthera leo* from App II to App I due to lack of support.

Southern white rhinoceros: Swaziland's population of *Ceratotherium simum simum* was **downlisted from App I to App II** (88 in favor, 15 against and 21 abstentions).

Nile crocodile: Namibia's populations of *Crocodylus niloticus* were transferred from App I to App II, while Zambia withdrew its proposal to subject its App II-listed *Crocodylus niloticus* to an annual export quota

African elephant: The elephant discussion forced an evening session. Elephant proposals proved divisive, especially among some African range States who have mixed opinions on how to address sustainable management and whether or not ivory trade is an option. Delegates in support of the Namibian proposal felt that CITES is not sending a good signal to governments and local communities who have invested significant time and money to set up efficient sustainable management programs and feel they are being penalized for others' mistakes in managing their own elephant populations. Delegates who rejected the proposal said they were more concerned about the bigger picture and believe that any ivory put on the market will generate more illegal activity. Many delegates agreed that the elephant ivory issue will be open-ended for years to come, despite attempts to "put it to rest." The COP ended but not before **Namibia succeeded in having part of its elephant proposal reconsidered** in Plenary, amending it, and having it passed! As amended, it allows export of non-commercial ivory hand crafted items (*ekibas*) individually marked and controlled. In a secret ballot voted but 71 for, 23 against and 35 abstained. The U.S. stated that it had voted for it; Kenya, Liberia and India announced they had voted against.

Source: Daily Bulletins - CITES