

**First National Symposium
Wildlife Policy and Legislation Review Process
27-28 September 2006**

To: Major (rtd) W. Kamunge
Chairman, Steering Committee
Wildlife Conservation and Management Policy and Legislation
Review Process, Ministry of Tourism and Wildlife, Nairobi

From: Dr. Michael Norton-Griffiths
Council Member, East African Wildlife Society, and
Chairman, Conservation Committee, EAWLS

Cc: All members of the Steering Committee

Date: 28 September 2006

Written Submission Following the First National Symposium

A. Wildlife Survival on Kenya's Rangelands: an economic perspective

1. I will be submitting to you a more fully written up version of the presentation I made at the 1st National Seminar concerning the economics of the survival of wildlife on Kenya's rangelands. It will also contain a concise summary of the major conclusions of the economic analysis.

B. Loss of Wildlife from Kenya's Protected Areas and Rangelands

2. Five presentations to the National Seminar all emphasised that wildlife numbers throughout Kenya have decreased by some 50% since the mid-70s – and continue so to do. There are few signs of a reversal to these trends, except perhaps with some species such as elephant that have received special attention.
3. The presentation by Samantha Russell on behalf of Dr. David Western was, in a way, the most depressing, for their data show unequivocally that loss rates are as great within the protected areas – whether National Parks or Game Reserves - - as outside the protected areas. This came as a shock as I, along with many others, had always held that loss rates were less within the Protected Areas.
4. The only areas which seemed, perhaps, to buck the trend were the wildlife conservancies on private land where wildlife numbers may have held their own or perhaps even increased.
5. These results have deep implications for the Policy Review Process – for these data show unequivocally that the **Policies** adopted by the Government of Kenya

over the last 30 years, and which have been encouraged, supported and defended by both the Donor and NGO communities, have **FAILED**. Specifically:-

- Inside the Protected Areas the failure has been one of implementation by the responsible authorities as wildlife have clearly not been protected;
 - Outside the Protected Areas there has also been a failure of implementation by the responsible authorities as it is equally clear that wildlife have not been protected. Furthermore, this has been exacerbated by an additional policy failure which restricts the abilities of landowners to:-
 - i. earn economic returns from their wildlife; or
 - ii. receive adequate compensation for loss of life, property, and agricultural and livestock production.
6. This 50% loss of wildlife is too well supported by truly massive amounts of objective data to be simply ignored, and is critical to the reformulation of wildlife policy. Clearly, the failed national wildlife policy has to be rewritten effectively from a blank slate. Everything must be reassessed, both policy and implementation, because everything done to date has failed. Simply tweaking the system is not enough. A deep rethink is necessary.

C. Comments on the Presentation on Canned Hunting in South Africa

7. An eloquent case was presented against "canned" hunting in South Africa with which everyone at the Seminar concurred. "Canned" hunting is obscene, and as far as I am aware it is of the greatest embarrassment to the conservation movement in South Africa.
8. However, a number of other strong claims were made in the course of this presentation which I think require careful thought and reflection:
- First: that hunting leads inevitably to canned hunting;
 - Second: that hunting in itself might elicit a tourist boycott; and
 - Third: that eco-tourism creates more revenues than does hunting.
9. Twenty three (23) countries in sub-Saharan Africa support a wildlife hunting industry. There is no evidence whatsoever from any of these countries of any trend towards canned hunting, with the single exception of South Africa. I think we can safely conclude that South Africa represents an anomaly here. Similarly, evidence for the stripping of resources by hunters is slim – although there have undoubtedly been examples of hunting getting out of control – e.g. in Kenya before the ban.
10. Similarly, there is no evidence from these twenty three countries of any tourism boycott associated with their hunting industry, apart from an assertion in the presentation that a tourism boycott of South Africa is gaining momentum overseas. Our neighbour Tanzania offers a striking example. Tanzania competes

strongly and very successfully against Kenya in the market for wildlife viewing tourism – despite having a well established hunting industry over many years. Indeed, the hunting industry in Tanzania is seen as an essential partner in conservation, especially in areas where tourists cannot and/or do not venture. Furthermore, there is no evidence that Kenya receives a tourism benefit from "ethical" tourists, neither does Kenya use the absence of hunting to market its wildlife tourism. The hunting ban seems to offer little comparative advantage to Kenya's tourism.

11. The relative gross revenues from eco-tourism versus consumptive utilisation are not straightforward to summarise, nor are their relative contributions to Government revenues or to Communities. However, these relative gross revenues are in fact **irrelevant** to any discussion about the benefits from the reintroduction of hunting. Hunting, like any other form of consumptive utilisation, is not an **alternative** to eco-tourism or to community conservation, but is **complimentary**.
12. We can again turn to our neighbour, Tanzania, for factual evidence of this. In Tanzania, the vast hunting areas in the Miombo woodlands in the west and south of the country are far removed from the tourist circuits and produce essential revenues to Government and Communities alike to support conservation and wildlife management. In contrast, the Serengeti National Park – perhaps the most famous conservation area in the world – supports adjacent hunting blocks to the south west (Maswa) and north west (Grumeti/Ikorongo). These form critical buffer zones against encroachment from agricultural land use, and generate significant funds for local communities. There is simply no evidence whatsoever that there is any boycott of the Serengeti by "ethical" eco-tourists because of these neighbouring hunting areas.
13. It would therefore seem that these three claims are largely false or irrelevant to our discussions.

Dr. M. Norton-Griffiths
P.O.Box 15227, Langata 00509
Tel: 890918 / 0722-618865
mng5@compuserve.com
web site: mng5.com