

Wildlife (Hunting) Policy Brief

Wildlife is an important source of revenue for Tanzania, from hunting concessions and trophy licences, from the export of live animals and, from the tens of thousands of tourists that visit the spectacular game parks and reserves each year that give the country such a strong competitive advantage in tourism. In fact it is estimated that 90% of tourism is based on wildlife and tourism is the fastest growing sector of the economy with an estimated 576,000 tourists arriving in 2003, up by nearly 200% on 1995, worth \$730million to the country. Wildlife also has a value to local communities (outside of the tourism sector) and contributes to food security and household incomes. Hunting of wildlife is seasonal, from July to December, and can take place in game reserves and in 'open areas', but is legal only under licence; citizens or residents usually hunt for bush-meat, while trophy hunting is only possible under a more expensive tourist hunting licence. Unfortunately the wildlife industry is characterised by an inefficient system of allocating hunting concessions and problems with quota management, poor rates of recovery of revenue, and an only limited participation of communities in the direction of management of the hunting sector. Poaching remains a problem in some areas, notably outside the game parks and reserves and there is strong resistance to reform of the sector by those who profit from the current situation.

This policy brief aims to inform DPG members of the Group's current understanding of the fundamental issues related to sustaining wildlife-based livelihoods and their contribution to poverty reduction. The Brief will highlight some key problem issues, outline the DPG-E's agreed strategic approach and identify some of key specific interventions designed to meet the various challenges to wildlife management in Tanzania.

Legal & Policy Context

The first wildlife legislation in Tanzania was introduced in 1890 and the first game reserve was gazetted in 1929. Today management of the wildlife sector is split between management of the national parks (by TANAPA), and the Ngorongoro Crater by the Ngorongoro Conservation Area Authority (NCAA) and the rest of the country by the Wildlife Division (WD), under the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism. The key instruments available for wildlife management are the National Parks Ordinance of 1959, which covers wildlife within national parks and is enforced by TANAPA; Ngorongoro Conservation Area Ordinance of 1959, enforced by the NCAA; the Forestry Ordinance of 1957, which covers forest reserves and is enforced by the Forestry Department; and the Wildlife Conservation Act of 1974/78, which covers wildlife outside national parks, supported by the Hunting Regulations (2000). A new wildlife conservation act is currently being revised and updated.

The Value of Wildlife in Tanzania

- **38% of Tanzania's lands are under some form of protection;**
- **Tourist hunting generates approx. \$27million gross, per annum;**
- **Tourist hunting earns the Wildlife Division ~ \$10million per annum;**
- **Buffalo yield the most trophy fees, followed by leopard and lion;**
- **~250 lion are shot each year under licence;**
- **An estimated 200 people are killed by wildlife each year.**

Overall, legislation is now guided by the Wildlife Policy (1998); especially important is the confirmation of the Government's overall right of ownership: *'In recognition of the importance of conservation of biological diversity to the livelihood of mankind, the state will retain the overall ownership of wildlife. The government will access user rights to various stakeholders, provide clear policy guidelines, stimulate public and private sector investment in the wildlife industry and provide support to investors'*.

Tanzania is also a signatory to regional and global conventions, notably the Convention on International Trade of Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES), Convention on Migratory Species (CMS), African-Eurasian Migratory Water Bird Agreement (AEWA), the Convention on Wetlands (Ramsar) and the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD).

Issue: Achieving equity in hunting policies

The lands and wildlife resources currently under protection were previously a vital resource to rural communities. This was not only to meet subsistence needs but also formed the basis of an important trade in wildlife products across the country. But in the first century or so of protection, until the mid-1980s, wildlife and most communities were kept apart. And the benefits from wildlife were channelled to the tourism industry and the national government; little account was taken of the loss of livelihood opportunities to local people.

In the decades since then the policy has evolved, first into a 'community outreach' approach and then more recently into an ecosystem approach, with local people included as participants in the ecosystems. The first structured programme was initiated in the early 1990s by TANAPA who established the Community Conservation Service (CCS); this sought to provide social services to rural communities near national parks as a means of compensating loss, but crucially it didn't allow local communities to control of, or even access to, benefits from the wildlife. More recently the Wildlife Policy (1998) recognized that wildlife conservation and management could no longer disregard the interests of rural communities and that they must receive benefits to mitigate the often significant costs of living with wildlife. These costs include the opportunity cost of access to land, forests etc that were previously contributing to people's livelihoods but were now protected, as well as the direct cost of damage caused by wildlife moving outside protected areas, both in terms of human lives and in terms of loss of crops etc.

The situation outside the game parks, adjacent to reserves under the management of the MNRT, has also changed and the Wildlife Division initiated a number of community-based natural resource management programmes. These included pilot projects that empower rural communities to obtain tangible benefits from wildlife, primarily through hunting rights. Most of these projects have been established with the assistance of international conservation NGOs and donor agencies.

'The conservation of wildlife and wild places calls for specialist knowledge, trained manpower and money, and we look to other nations to co-operate with us in this important task the success or failure of which not only affects the continent of Africa but the rest of the world as well.'

(Julius K Nverere. 1961)

One of the most important of these programmes is the Wildlife Management Area (WMA), defined as *'an area declared by the Minister to be so and set aside by village governments for the purpose of biological natural resource conservation'*. Clearly the thinking behind this is to change the relationship between communities and wildlife so that wildlife is seen as a livelihood opportunity rather than a livelihood threat.

In exchange for implementing conservation activities a village can qualify for WMA status and lease trophy hunting or game viewing concessions to tourist companies or use the WMA as a managed hunting area for the village itself. There were 16 pilot WMAs partially in place in 2004 which are believed to be quite successful in reducing illegal hunting and the conservation status of the areas under management and studies of these pilots indicate that they can provide up to \$2,000 annually per village.

But as yet not a single non-pilot WMA has been created that have followed the procedures defined in the WMA Regulations, despite the local demand for such initiatives. Current delays in the pilot sites revolve around registration of the CBO, obtaining the necessary Authorised Association (AA) status and in getting legal recognition of user rights. It is also debatable how much capacity there is currently in district natural resource offices, and in the villages themselves, to support the WMA concept. It is also apparent that doing the paperwork necessary to obtain a license to offer tourism opportunities is so onerous that it is generally only the established companies that have the skills to qualify, and they are more likely to transfer much of the cash-income outside of the local economy. Finally, WMAs do not meet the needs of all types of communities. Pastoral communities in particular are disadvantaged by the sedentary, village-based WMA system, and yet they live in some of the most wildlife-rich areas, but with wildlife that they are often in conflict with. As long as conflict exists it is likely that the wildlife will be the loser. There are opportunities to offer a form of AA status to nomadic communities in line with the Wildlife Conservation Act of 1974.

Issue: Managing Concessions and Quotas

In 2003, 40 companies were licensed to run tourist hunting operations on 142 concessions across Tanzania, up from 131 in 2002. The current system to allocate these concessions is generally seen as arbitrary and short-term and there is no competitive-bidding system in place. Such a system can result for example in concessions being awarded to companies without the necessary skills to run an efficient hunting operation or to companies that then sub-lease concessions and quotas, potentially depriving the country of tax and other revenues. The system is open to corruption and does not necessarily engender sustainable hunting practices by concession-holders. Options for change have been investigated in recent years however; for example in 1993 a Government/NGO consultation workshop recommended that hunting blocks be allocated using a tender system in which a minimum of five blocks may be allocated to one company. The 1998 Policy also sought an improved method of allocation but stakeholder consultations with the Tanzania Hunting Operators Association (TAHOA) and a committee of experts headed by the Director of the WD resulted in no change to the status quo with the allocation method still seen 'as the best method', and with conservation benefits stated as being the most important reasons for persisting with allocation.

On each concession, an annual quota is issued for a range of species and the current system requires that operators must utilize 40% of their annual quota, although the data are poor and opportunities for poaching into neighbouring concessions where better game may be found is a known problem. By way of example, in Selous Game Reserve less than 50% of the lion quota was taken (officially) during the 2003 hunting season. It is also certain that a relatively limited degree of hunting above quota takes place in some concessions, and this prompted the Director of Wildlife to issue a Call for Compliance to all hunters in 2004. For their part concession-holders are required to support anti-poaching activities in cooperation with the Wildlife Division. New Wildlife Conservation (Tourist Hunting) Regulations were issued by the MNRT in 2000.



Although quotas are often viewed as difficult to enforce, a minimum prerequisite is that they are based on the ability of the wildlife to sustain the proposed off-take. However, most quota-setting is based largely on anecdotal reports from game officers in the field and from the hunting companies themselves. In some instances quotas have been issued that exceed the population of animals in the hunting block. For example, a former Minister issued permits for hunting 750 hippopotamus in the Kilombero area to three companies although in fact the area's total hippo population was less than 750. There are also special provisions for a discretionary Presidential License but for which there is no mandatory fee and no requirement to assess the conservation impact of the quota allocated. In fact the quota system isn't necessarily an appropriate method of managing wild populations, especially for the males of highly-valued 'trophy' animals. These individuals tend to have well-developed secondary sexual characteristics, such as large antlers, horns, tusks or mane. Although these traits generally grow with age, high-quality individuals may show precocious physical development and thus be shot before they are able to breed, with obvious negative effects those species' populations. The new approach is therefore to impose minimum-size limits; for lion for example the emerging standard is to only take those at six years of age or above, and TAHOA has already passed a measuring binding its members to observe this standard.

DPG-E

In fact the true performance of the current quota-allocation system is currently little understood because there is relatively little monitoring of wildlife populations in the hunting areas. In the absence of a good data-set, and as might be expected, there are various positions taken on the current resource status of species targeted by tourist hunting. Some key local researchers into lion populations for example are relaxed about their status and do not report any decline in numbers in recent years. However, it is also true that only two populations, in Ngorongoro and Serengeti, have been studied in any detail over recent years and there is some international concern over the stability of lion populations. Elephant populations stabilised or increased in the 1990s according to recent survey work by a specialist group, although their range has been reduced, from near 90% of the country fifty-years ago to only about 50% today. In 2002, Tanzania doubled the number of trophy tusks for legal export, from 100 to 200. Leopard are believed to be robust to hunting pressure as long as conservation activities continue. The African Savannah Buffalo is threatened by poaching, and rinderpest and other diseases and by drought, but there are fewer concerns about the threat of hunting to the population of about 300,000 animals, as long as more general conservation measures from which they benefit persist. Outside the game parks and reserves the situation is less encouraging, with the illegal bush-meat trade an ever increasing pressure on wildlife resources.

Issue: Revenue Distribution

There are a number of sources of revenue from wildlife hunting. The lease of concessions actually only contributes about 10% of total hunting revenue to the Wildlife Division, while game fees and daily fees contribute 80%. The effect of having such low concession fees is that the only feasible means for the Wildlife Division to raise income is to increase the number of animals hunted through raising quotas. Overall revenue from tourist hunting licences was \$8.8million in 2003.

Hunting permits and game fees for resident hunters are paid directly to district councils, which retain 100% of the revenue. Tourist hunting fees, including trophy fees and WD observer fees, are paid directly to the WD, a proportion of which are then redistributed to district councils in which the hunting takes place and to the Tanzania Wildlife Protection Fund. In fact 25% of tourist hunting fees are returned to district councils but this was worth on average just \$12,125 per district in 2003, with Kilombero District, \$39,000, gaining the most.

It is argued by some commentators that most of these revenues only ever get as far as the district level, and do not find their way down to villages or communities. Much of the best hope for improving local communities' direct income from wildlife hunting is based on establishing effective community-managed areas, such as WMAs, run by local authorized associations. Note that this is not a question re-distribution of wealth but is a question of fair compensation, because communities bear very real costs from the presence of wildlife. However, the local generation of revenues from WMAs remains contentious.

There is a more direct route for the transfer of benefits from hunting; directly from the hunting outfitters to the local communities. The consensus agreements between outfitters and the WD include a condition to '*offer assistance to communities adjacent to hunting areas*' and to integrate its conservation activities with the needs of the adjacent communities. Although there are some good working examples, the assistance is typically poorly observed because there is no provision for its actual implementation or monitoring, and it often ends up being more or less *ad hoc* contributions from the concession holders.

Addressing the Issues - Work in Progress

A number of other initiatives have been taken by Government and development partners within the field of monitoring, quota setting, and improved revenue generation and retention:

- A report on the Tourist Hunting Industry has recently been produced (2004) This study is confidential, copies have been presented to the MNRT, but there has yet been a formal response;
- A database has been developed for tourist hunting in the Selous Game Reserve to manage data derived from a hunting monitoring programme, including trophy quality, first introduced in 1998. The database (but without trophy monitoring) has been expanded to game reserves in north-western Tanzania;
- Retention schemes, whereby 50% of the income generated from hunting within game reserves remains with the management, have been established in Selous Game Reserve, Rukwa Game Reserve and the game reserves of north-western Tanzania in response to GTZ and the European Union interventions.

Finally, the financial administration of the Tourist Hunting Section was computerised in the mid-nineties with financial assistance from a donor. It was finalised in 1998, but the system has not yet been implemented.

Addressing the Issues - Recommendations

Reform must address at least the following aspects:

- The WMA concept holds real potential to effect local poverty and conflict reduction. The Lawyer's Environmental Action Team (LEAT) suggest that if this approach is to realize its full potential the government would need to modify some procedural aspects to establishing WMAs by streamlining the process of providing villages with title to their land, which is a WMA prerequisite;

lays to the WMA process could also be minimized by removing the roles of regional authorities, and leaving more regulatory and supervisory powers to districts and responsible ministries.

•D
e

- There is a need therefore also to improve the capacity of local communities to qualify for WMA status and then to manage the associated natural resources
- Effective market-based competition for hunting concessions should be introduced, as suggested in 1993, with appropriate qualification criteria for outfitters to meet before bidding and size limits for trophy species must be strictly adhered to and monitoring should be rigorous;
- Hunting must not be allowed to deplete wildlife resources and so an improved data-set on resource status and hunting activity needs to be available. There is a need therefore for an improved monitoring system to be designed and implemented with adequate data management facilities; and,
- The Ministry of Finance (and TRA) should be supported in undertaking a review of the hunting sector including taxation-rates and procedures, and a review of the financial status and management of the Wildlife Division. Transparent accounting systems and computerisation must be introduced.

The Development Partner Group

The Development Partners Group (DPG) recognises the crucial importance of collective and increasingly coordinated/harmonised efforts of the DPG should result in significantly improved effectiveness and quality of development assistance to Tanzania while reducing transaction costs for development partners and Government.

Membership of the DPG is open to any bilateral or multilateral partner that provides development assistance to the United Republic of Tanzania. The rationale for a DPG that does not include Government membership is to complement Government's own coordination efforts by promoting internal coherence amongst the development partners in the context of TAS and the Rome Declaration.

Membership currently comprises Belgium (BTC), Canada (CIDA), Denmark, European Delegation, Finland, France, Germany (GTZ, Embassy and KfW), Ireland (DCI), Italy, Japan (Embassy and JICA), Netherlands, Norway, Spain, Sweden (SIDA), Switzerland (SDC), UK (DFID), US (USAID), UNDP, UNICEF, ILO, UNFPA, UNIDO, UNAIDS, UNCDF, WFP, UNHCR, FAO, UNESCO, WHO, UN-Habitat, IMF, World Bank.

The DPG maintains a website at www.tzdac.or.tz where further information is available.