

**NWX-DOI-FISH AND WILDLIFE (US)**

**Moderator: Cade London  
September 27, 2018  
3:08 pm CDT**

(Eric): Mr. Chairman, members of the public, we have a quorum, so we can begin at your leisure.

Man: Thank you, (Eric). If we can get everyone situated, we'll try to get started here. It seems the ones to my left are among the missing at the moment.

Man: The ones selected will be the Sergeant in Arms?

Man: Yes.

Man: Okay. (unintelligible).

Man: Okay. It's certainly good to see everyone here this morning. I was quite impressed with the presentations we had yesterday. I hope everyone in the audience was, as well. This morning, we have one bit of business to do to start. Yesterday, we were issued the minutes from our previous meeting. They had been sent out right after the meeting. We were given them again yesterday. Everybody should've had a chance to digest them by now, so I would like a motion to approve the minutes from our previous meeting.

(Mr. Crane): So moved.

Man: Motion from (Mr. Crane). A second?

(Mr. Horn): Second.

Man: Second from (Mr. Horn). Any discussion? Those in favor, say aye.

All: Aye.

Man: Those opposed. It's unanimous. Okay. We'll move right into our presenters this morning.

Man: Mr. Chairman, can I make a couple of quick announcements to the public?

Man: Okay.

Man: So again, I'd like to remind those that were yesterday and folks that just joined us today, public restrooms are out the way you came in around the back of the building. We do have one restroom here for the members of the council to use. We will be breaking promptly around 11:30 and rejoining back at 1:00. Anyone who wants to sign up for comments at the end of the day, there will be a sign-up sheet up by the door, and please put your name down on it. We'll pick it up right around lunchtime, after lunch. Thank you.

Man: Okay. Our presentations today will be broad as far as topics concerned, but it's principally sustainable wildlife management for the benefit of people and species. Our first presenter is (Dr. Joseph Avoya). He's a professor at the

University of Botswana and tourism studies at the Okavango Research Institute.

(Professor Avoya) holds a Ph.D. in tourism studies from that great school of the southwest, Texas A&M University. Currently an associate professor of tourism studies at the Okavango Research Institute, I've had the opportunity to read some of his findings and his papers, and I am quite impressed and looking forward to hearing him in person. Professor?

(Dr. Joseph Avoya): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Council, for the invitation to come and speak to you. (unintelligible) minister, thank you, and I acknowledge all of you who are here. This is my presentation outline. I'll do some self-introduction in a (unintelligible), then talk about why am I making this presentation.

I'll also talk to the subject of sustainable wildlife conservation and community development. I'll also talk to benefits of hunting in Botswana. I'll talk a bit about the hunting ban and the results, and then I'll conclude. A bit about myself, I did environmental sciences at the University of Botswana for my undergrad and MS, Ph.D. in tourism sciences at Texas A&M. My first degree and second degree was sponsored by the government of Botswana.

My Ph.D., I was full grant scholar sponsored by the US State Department. My research interest on how tourism can be made to promote conservation and achieve community development, and currently, I'm a professor of tourism studies at the University of Botswana. I'm also the director of Okavango Research Institute. I'm married, and my wife is here. About my institute where I work, our mandate is simple. To collect data, there is the data that we should use to advise policy.

We then applied research at the Okavango Research Institute, and we are doing that following five thematic areas. Those are listed here, and we have graduate program, LCLTD, and our motto really is to go out there, do research in wetlands and the wetlands being the Okavango Delta and the distant drylands. We are 33 academic staff members, 50 support staff, and much of our fund really comes from external forces.

If you're in academia, you understand what I'm talking about. You have to write proposals, and you have to get funding from outside government or if it's within government, it should be from the ten grantee organizations. Fifty-one percent of our funding comes from the investments, and 69% comes from elsewhere, so of late, we have been having a lot of funding from EEL, from the Germans to fund most of our research programs.

So, I've been invited here by the US Fish and Wildlife Service. I've been asked to talk to you about sustainable wildlife conservation and community development. I've been asked to give an analysis of how legal hunting is compatible and beneficial to both conservation and community development. I'll also maybe discuss a bit about defects of hunting in an area where you have maybe high wildlife populations, and finally, I'll talk about why hunting should be a conversation tool, why we should consider hunting to be a conservation tool.

A bit about Botswana where I work, we are in southern Africa. We were a British protectorate until 1966. Our population is lower than that of Namibia. They're 2.5; we are 2.2, and we are a democracy. After every five years, we go for elections. There are elections next year. Botswana is as big as Texas in terms of Iceland, France or Kenya, and you look at the surface area. About 17% is reserved for protected areas. That's now parks and game reserves, and 32% is reserved for wildlife management areas.

So, in reality, what you are seeing is that in Botswana, it will tell of 59% of the land is reserved for wildlife. Tourism is the second largest economic sector in the country. That is after diamond mining, and tourism accounts for about 4.5% while of late, they will tell you almost 6% and the like. Hunting mostly down in the northern parts of the county, there is no hunting in game reserve and protected areas, I mean, and national parks, but hunting is down in wildlife management areas.

I'll talk to that a bit later. Maybe we should understand why people hunt. Some hunt because of subsistence purposes, because they want food to put on the table. Some hunt because they want to acquire the products and sell them for profit, and some are recreational hunters. They do hunt for sport. But when you look at the hunting debate, you'll realize that there are people who are simply opposed to hunting. They're against hunting for the simple reason that they don't want to see animals being killed.

Similarly, you have people who are for hunting because they say hunting has been controlled and has more financial benefits than photographic tourism, and in addition to that, they say hunting is a kind of tourism. So, what we have with the situation whereby the debate around hunting attempts to become popularized.

However, my major concern has been that some of the people involved in those debates, they don't have the evidence or the information really of what is going on especially what is going on in Africa or what is going on in some of this community areas. Some just oppose hunting without information. Then we have to provide the information. Is hunting a problem? I want us to look at some of the words said by these people. I got this when I was Texas A&M,

and I think all the gentlemen and the ladies are not—you know them in the US. They are not in Africa.

Yes, I know they might know those guys, but I remember in reaching Texas A&M, I was asked to read all these books about all these conversation guys. So, what I'm simply saying here is that the problem of game management is not how we shall handle the gear. That is in the US. The real problem is one of human management. Wildlife management is comparatively easy. Human management is difficult, so when you look at the debates around hunting really, it's all about how do we manage humans.

To begin with, I had to know something about people, the country and the trees, and of the three, the first one is the most important. Change happens by listening and then holding a dialog with people who are doing something you don't believe is right. So, I think that one sets the tone of whether hunting is problem or not. So, let's look at hunting and community development in Botswana, what has been the opinion over the years before the hunting ban in Germany 2014.

The sun is good here, and African countries still endowed with a lot of wildlife resources, and for a very long time, communities were or they had access to wildlife because of the laws and the policies in the country. We shall allow them to do so. Mainly the tourism put itself in 1990s in the review. The wildlife conversation policy of 1986 is also in that review. I'm told in 2015, they tried to pass it, but it's not passed yet, still a draft, and the community based natural resource management policy of 2007, these are policies, government policies which are trending, you know.

We actually promote access by communities to wildlife resources. But because of those policies, what happened in the late 1980s, not only in

Botswana, but in eastern, southern Africa. Most of the countries in eastern southern Africa, you had Namibia, you had Tanzania, you study. Very soon, I'll think you'll be hearing Zimbabwe.

Because of this idea of bringing in communities to benefit from wildlife, to align conservation with road development to bring in benefits to communities. Community business should do assessment even for programs were established. The first one would be campfire in Zimbabwe, and ours is a community-based research assessment agent, so the whole idea really was to bring in communities so that they benefit from wildlife in their areas.

What this program is saying is that you must put any kind of development to wildlife resources. If you want communities to participate in conservation, put an economic variable to those. They shouldn't see wildlife as a nuisance that destroy their crops, but they should have that variable of benefits. Division of power, you must make communities exercise their rights in decision making, and also you should make communities accept that we can work together as a collective in terms of the management of resources.

So, this is the approach that the community-based natural resource management program is built up on. But the problem is simply saying or it integrates conservation and road development. The two should go together, and the approach is the same. We should reject to the top level approach and accept the bottom level approach where there's different transition of natural resources, where the communities have their say in the use of resources.

So, in Botswana, what happened was that in 1982, the country or wildlife areas were divided into small end units that you can see in there which are called controlled hunting areas, so northern Botswana is divided into small end units. So, these land units were popularly known as concession areas.

People know them as concession areas and the land consumptive controlled hunting areas, concession areas which promoted hunting.

They're told as buffer zones, the team community areas and whole wildlife areas, so in whole wildlife areas like in this now park reserve, hunting is not allowed up to today, so hunting was banned in buffer zones. I think this made the conservation clear. This is the government district in northern Botswana. There's no hunting going on in Moremi Game Reserve, but hunting was banned in Ng City. Those are buffer zones.

You can see that that block is Ng City, Ng City 4, Ng 29, so hunting was banned on those buffer zones, and you look down. You can see they're not (unintelligible). You can see at the top some of those villages buffer, and that's good, so those villages which are actually having the Ng Cities and the Ng 22 as buffer zones between call areas where wildlife lived and the communities. It's one or the other on Pointer Hill, do a better job. So, trophy hunting and the other thing that you should recognize is that in Botswana, trophy hunting was banned in areas we should call (unintelligible).

These are areas with a bit less wildlife compared to call areas. Call areas like Moremi Game Reserve, (Belgahats) of the wildlife area with a lot of wildlife where photographic tourism is the only use that is allowed in there. So, what we are seeing is that when you do safari hunting in marginal areas, you have a situation where really you are using an area which in other ways would be not good for photographic tourism. That aspect, that was banned in Botswana.

Every year, there was an annual wildlife couter. People don't wake up in the morning, take guns, get in the bush and hunt. There are the wildlife couter that's determined by the government, and every year, there was to be an area outside to determine the number of species or the number of animals which

are to be hunted, so when you do that, you actually bring hunting here as a management tool.

You know you have 100 maybe leopards or lions, and you only want to hunt about 10 or so, and you leave 90 which the range can support, so there's exactly what was built out in the country. That's just an example of the wildlife coutures which were given until 2011 in northern Botswana. So, what I'm trying to argue for her is that when you have a wildlife couture like that, when you know or you determine how much you should take out of the bush, then your hunting becomes a management tool. It is not actually a menace that people would say.

When the community-based natural resource management program was introduced in the country, there was so much negative attention to wildlife conservation, but because people started benefitting from these resources through hunting, the negative attention started to change, and people started to see wildlife as something that they can co-exist and to live with. That's why that guy or that gentleman is arguing, but successful wildlife conservation is an issue of who owns the wildlife.

If communities believe they own the wildlife, and we should manage it, if they believe the part and parcel of the management, if they believe wildlife is theirs, the old wildlife, then you have a higher chance really of achieving conservation, but you alienate them from that. You take them away from ownership, from benefits, and they say wildlife is government property, then you have a problem especially in Africa.

So, let's look at some of the benefits of hunting in Botswana before the ban. You'll agree with me or most of what you saw was what I said yesterday that almost three-quarters of the revenue that accrue in communities came from

safari hunting, so between 2009 and 2010, almost 53 million pula came from safari hunting, and one dollar is close to 10 pula, so 53 million, you divide that by 10, you'll get how much, \$3 million, yes, so what I'm saying there is that almost three-quarters of the revenue which communities derive.

I think from the video you saw yesterday, much of that money in Africa, not only in Zimbabwe where the video came from, much of that money gets invested in other community projects we see in communities. So, in Botswana, the revenue that they derived from safari hunting—well, actually, you can prove that everywhere you see that hat in the corner, all those hats in the corner. When I did my MSC, my Master degrees, Master of Science degrees, that was the situation in one of the villages, but when I came back 10 years later, you can see those one-room houses. You can see the satellite dish there.

They can try to see what is going on in other parts of the world. They can watch soccer games, as well. You can see sometimes when large—that is the money from hunting and reinvested into photographic tourism and helped the community at large. You can see the guy at the corner there with water articulation in their compound, and you can see the truck with improved transportation in some of these areas. Those guys there, I've liked, so what I'm trying to say there is that the money from safari hunting improved the livelihoods of some of these communities in Botswana.

In addition to that, a lot of special cities or special community issues were funded by income from hunting. For example, you'll be hearing all this insurance around (unintelligible) or whatever everybody in the village is insured. When they die, the insurance comes in, and they get buried, almost everybody in the village. You'll be hearing about scholarships for their

students. You'll be hearing all those houses you can see in there, bad for senior citizens from money from income from safari hunting.

You can see whenever the point's taken, see an old woman seated at the back of the house or the hut backed by the community from income coming from safari hunting. There are also household dividends where people are give some money. So, what I'm trying to say here is that the money from safari hunting really improved some of the livelihoods of the communities. It is the intention of the government to see people employed, to see people's lives being improved, and I think you'll agree with me that benefits from safari hunting in the case of these villages were used in a way which improved people's livelihoods.

The other important thing in addition to livelihoods is the improvement in people's attitudes towards conservation. In Namibia, we were told yesterday that there has been no poaching of rhino for some time because the communities, they do accept that they own the rhino, they protect the rhino unlike a situation where communities are not part and parcel of the whole conservation process. They will have criminals from other countries to poach the rhino, but in that part and parcel of the entire process, they will report suspicious guys to authorities, and they will be arrested.

Increase the involvement of communities and conservation programs, what we see in Botswana is that because of the benefits from hunting, more communities wanted to form community trust. They wanted to register those. They ask for more land to be reserved for tourism, for wildlife benefit and the like, and that on its own helps to keep the land. A presenter from Tanzania yesterday said communities are no longer benefiting from certain blocks of land because of the ban and the like, and I see those areas being tended to culture the land instead of conservation. So, it becomes the other way around.

If they are benefiting, they will change some of this land center and support conservation if they benefit from wildlife. Request to have land included in wildlife management projects, this is actually common. It was common during the campfire in Zimbabwe. Increased social and cultural pressures can make you over the development of land use management. Actually, if communities benefit from wildlife, you see this includes corporation between wildlife rangers and the communities and like a situation where the two don't interact.

Communities would hate the wildlife rangers, and the wildlife rangers on the other hand were trying to arrest the communities for poaching, but if they benefit, the two will work together to promote conversation, and this has resulted in some increase in some of the wildlife populations. Namibia, they were saying when they got independence, almost all the animals were gone because of poaching, but now there has been a recovery of the wildlife populations.

Some of the species in Botswana also have recovered. Still, in Zimbabwe, you have some of the species which have recovered because of community involvement. So, the hunting ban in Botswana, what happened with that? In January 2014, Botswana government took us back to how it had been where I can see some of the ministers from the Botswana government here.

The empty villages, they can all make us, and I can see empty (unintelligible) they made a motion in Parliament to reintroduce hunting this year, so in 2014, hunting was banned, but I don't think it went through Parliament, and my question now is what are the implications of the hunting ban to wildlife conservation including (unintelligible)? Really what motivated the hunting ban, what was the main reason behind that motivation?

There was a ban which was carried out, and that was denoted that some wildlife species were on decline, and the questions of the decline were hunting, poaching, human encroachment into wildlife habitats and the like, drought and bush fires, and the years by then in the ministry environment wildlife and tourism decided to announce the hunting ban because of this decrease, but looking at what was the opinion at the time, the green bushes, some of the animal species which were there were not declining. The elephant was one of those species which were not declining.

This was six times from government. It's not my statistics. The red one, yes, I agree. These are the species which were on decline, and I could not understand why the ban for species which were not on decline. It's like you catch one boy with cocaine in their pockets in the classroom, and then you close the entire school. You don't do that. Why don't you deal with the boy with cocaine? Why don't we handle the species which were on decline and maybe stop, suspend hunting and allow hunting for species which are on the increase? I'm saying this because I think you'll agree with me, but elephants, the curving rate for elephants is about 5% annually, so you can imagine 5% of 207,000.

How much elephants do we have in Botswana on an annual basis? By the way, you can talk about the mortality, the water rate, but the figures there are very small as compared to the curving rate. So, after the hunting ban, there was a lot of revenue. This was the groups of the communities which were involved in this, so most of them that lost almost half of their income, they lost the jobs. Every government wants to see people thrive and working and supporting their families, but I don't think any government wants to see people losing jobs.

There's yet another presentation by somebody else who talk about the effects of hunting in the area which is actually one of the districts or the provinces in the country, and that says 4,800, the livelihoods are affected. There was a loss of meat, protein and the loss of income, almost 14 million there. So, income generated by communities go down. So, it means employment opportunities got lost like I've already said. There was no income to pay whoever was working in those community areas. There was no more income generated from safari hunting.

So, what it meant was that some community projects had to be stopped, and to me, by then, I could see a reversal of the gains which the program achieved in 30 years of its existence in Botswana. So, all of a sudden, all the gains and all the good things which communities enjoyed for 30 years were, like, being reversed. What you have been seeing in Botswana of late is that the elephant population is going up.

I just mentioned that elephants' curving rate is almost 5%, so they keep on increasing, and what also has happened that the elephants that are expanding into other areas which previously were not supporting elephants westwards and southwards, most of the elephants were in the northwest district of there, a few in that corner of the central district, but with the hunting ban, we started seeing elephants from the northwest moving into the hunting district there, moving into hunting district down there into the (Halafadi) district down there and into the (Gwenan) district, so elephants started moving into, you know, westwards and southwards of Botswana.

In addition to that, we started having elephants from Namibia, elephants from Zambia, elephants from Zimbabwe coming to Botswana, and right now, Botswana, I think we are hosting almost half of the elephant population of Africa, and it is too much. When these elephants are expanding into this area,

they did not spare the crops or the vegetation on their way. This slide is not mine. It's from one of my students. The student visited this community in the (Watiti) area.

You can see the green on the top right. Those are crops, and the following day when the student went down there to the same crop, you can see what the elephants did, so what we are seeing here is that the entire livelihood of that farming area was gone because of the elephants. In addition to that, you have the vegetation being destroyed by elephants. You can see the trees down there when you have many elephants in the area.

So, what's I'm trying to say is that the expression of this elephant population had with it or has with it crop damage, vegetation damage, cutting, you know, escalating the human-wildlife conflict. This again is not my slide. It's a slide from my student, and you can see the perceptions there of communities now tending against wildlife to a point where an elephant seen as the devil. Elephant was made by Satan, so they said. We plow elephant habitat.

So, these are some of the results which are coming from my students, my graduate students. This is another slide from of my students again. This is last year in the (Charger) district. This student was descending elsewhere last week, and I took her slide, and she simply said after all these things—so what she's describing here is that some of the farmers are given assistance by the government, and when elephants raid your crop field, you are not allowed to shoot it. You have to call the wildlife rangers to come in to shoot the animal, and this is from all of them, after all of them from the government, the trip...

Woman: (unintelligible).

(Dr. Joseph Avoya): Oh, okay. Yes, nowadays they have even bought cell phones to call them when there is corporating, and after corporating, the government pays us. I believe we are cultivating our fields to feed the government elephants. You can see the perception there, the last statement. I believe we are cultivating fields to feed government elephants.

So, what it means here is that the perceptions have changed. There are cultivation of change, and now when an elephant is perceived as a nuisance, then we have a problem in conservation. I want us to look at what government tried to propose around 2009, 2011, coming up with an elephant management plan, and the whole thing was spoiled, and by talking about it now, we took everything from that draft elephant management plan, and I will just read it to you as it is.

"In 1990, conserve that a greater number of elephants could not be sustained led to a decision to keep the elephant population at 60,000. At the time, there were approximately 55,000 elephants. The 1990 conservation and management of elephant in Botswana plan proposed the removal of about 3,000 elephants per year as a way of achieving this."

So, what I'm trying to say that the draft elephant management plan simply said the range in Botswana, the area in Botswana can sustain 60,000 elephants, but now we have almost 250,000 elephants in the country. It's like you have a range. You are told you are to have 20 cows, and you have 200 cows in that range. This building you are told you're supposed to maybe have 100 people, and you put 500 people, so this is what you're talking about, and the expectations your range or your area is supposed to keep 60,000 elephants, and you allow 250,000 elephants, so it's not okay. You're going to change that environment to become like a grassland or as a savannah or whatever.

So, we don't want that, and my proposal is that something needs to be done with the elephant population in Botswana. When you stop communities from benefiting from hunting, the results of that some are let's go out there and poach and hunt, right, and you don't want poaching. We have some of the scholars' rules as simply saying a hungry man is very dangerous to the environment. He's an enemy to the environment because when he's hungry, he will get into the bush, and he will just kill as much as possible.

We have a situation where some vultures in the country have died because of poisoning, and when the community is not benefiting from wildlife, and they are less talk has been killed, they will poison the carcass, and the vultures would come, and animals would die. We don't want to reach that. That's why we are saying we need to manage what we can when we still have the time. In conclusion, I'd like to mention safari hunting is 15% of the tourism revenue from only 1% of the tourist arrival, and this makes safari hunting one of the lowest in terms of the footprints, in terms of impact when you compare it with photographic tourism, and safari hunting targets males which are old, and only 2% to 5% really gets removed from the bush.

There is insignificant impact really when you look at safari hunting especially to wildlife populations in Botswana or in Africa especially the elephant. I wanted to note that revenue from sustainable safari hunting in community areas resulted in improved populations in the past, and people wanted to go move to wildlife conservation. It increased involvement of communities in community programs and projects and with those requests for more land to be used for wildlife management, and wildlife actually increased in some areas.

The Namibian example is a good example if I were to write a paper, I would talk to Namibians, too, write a very good paper on how community involvement can actually result in increased wildlife populations. This

actually has been found to be the case by so many scholars, not myself alone, but other scholars.

What I'm saying is we need to have selective hunting in countries like Botswana especially the elephant and the buffalo. I think you are aware that the buffalo is said to be carrying the foot and mouth virus, and when the buffalo comes in contact with livestock, what happens is the cows, they get affected, so we are talking about species which one or the other are impoverishing communities, and we cannot just let them as they are, and I'm also arguing that even if we can go spot hunting in Botswana tomorrow, hunting really will not do a dent to the elephant population and the buffalo population.

It would not do a dent because in most cases, we just remove about 400 animals, and we have these animals increasing at this alarming rate. It won't do a dent. So, I don't see hunting being a problem in any way in as far as Botswana is concerned. I think I was born and bred in Botswana. About 50 years, I lived in Botswana, and I don't believe hunting can do a dent to the wildlife populations in the country.

I'm saying maintain the concept of buffer zones to manage human-wildlife conflicts. I have a point that you can see the section where I have all those lands. What I'm simply trying to say is that we should enhance in those areas and keep the animals in the blue area, keeping animals away from communities, from crop areas and from livestock farmers and keep them to the blue area and give them that, and have hunting in that belt which to me is a buffer zone. The other thing that I'm proposing is that we should have our wildlife corridors open.

There should be corridors to certain points and don't allocate cultural activities in those areas, in those corridors. Leave them open. Animals, elephants know that these paths through this area to the drinking spots and the contact using the same route so maintain those. The other argument that I'm bringing in here is that conservation or scientific best practice actually brings together social ecological framework and the economic framework.

You bring these two together, and then you achieve a balance. You don't promote the ecological framework alone leaving the human aspect behind. You don't do that. If you do that, it's not scientific best practice, right. So, conservation cannot succeed in the long term if local communities are alienated from wildlife benefits. That's what I'm trying to say. Yesterday, I don't know that it was the minister from Namibia, he simply said you can put as many guns as possible in wildlife areas, and you won't achieve conservation.

Studies have shown that you may put as many guns as possible if communities are not involved. You may put as many secret citizens as possible in community areas, but if communities are benefiting and are not involved, you will not achieve conservation. You can minimize the conservation. You have all the helicopters in wildlife areas, but you'll not achieve conservation unless and until you recognize the fact that conservation is a stakeholder activity where you bring all practice together, and they work together to achieve it.

So, that's my argument. Bring the communities, bring the social, bring government, bring policy, then you achieve conservation. Kenya, in 1977, banned safari hunting, but we are told that the wildlife decline in that country is very high, up to 40%. They banned safari hunting, and whenever there were elephant tusks each way obtained from poachers and the like, they would

ban them, but they have not achieved or stopped the decline of wildlife species. Actually, Kenya at the moment is talking about reintroducing hunting.

They were supposed to have a meeting this month. It was postponed to February next year, also, and we're going to be attending it, and we're going to telling to that reintroduce hunting, and my last idea, I'm simply saying yes, photographic tourism is good, but it is not the answer to all the conservation problems or the community development problems. Photographic tourism is okay. Keep it in core areas like Moremi Game Reserve, but you need to understand that we should have an integrated land use planning approach where we have land for photographic tourism and land for safari hunting and allow communities to benefit. That is what I'm trying to say.

I know some people are saying photographic tourism is the answer, and I'm saying photographic tourism is not an answer on its own. It needs to be done side by side with safari hunting especially the marginal areas have safari hunting. So, with all those concerns, I'm making my discussion. Thank you very much.

Man: That was an outstanding presentation. I think we—let's see. Do I have someone else wanting to make statements? Is that what you're saying, (Eric)? Okay. Is there someone else from Botswana that...

(Eric): Actually, we can—so we can ask any questions to the last presenter, and then we have a minister that would like to follow up on his comments.

Man: Certainly. Okay. So, let's ask some questions of Professor Avoya. You had a phenomenal speech there. I've read a lot of your work before. A lot of it was included there.

Some questions I have as a person who's been Botswana several times clear back in the early 90's and then more recent, as well, you said that there were initially about 400 permits per year back when hunting was taking place and that the country has a carrying capacity of about 55 to 60,000 elephants, and my times up on the Zambesi River especially in the dry season when so many elephants are converging on the river.

It appeared the habitat for bush life for other animals along the river was being terribly degraded. If hunting were reinstated and 400 elephants were taken a year, what is your plan for the other 160,000 that's above the carrying capacity?

Are you going to do a major culling or have the communities involved working with it? You hate to see one species degrade the habitat so badly for so many other dikars and small antelopes. That would be my question.

(Dr. Joseph Avoya): Yes, is it okay? Thank you. That one, it's a question for the Botswana government...

Man: That's why the minister is here.

(Dr. Joseph Avoya): ...for the minister, but what I know what is pending at the moment is that there is some consultation going on to come up with a proper elephant management plan, and I think the elephant management plan should come up with recommendations of what is to be done. In 2011 in that draft, I think you saw that there was a recommendation to take down 3,000 elephants per year until you reach 60,000.

I don't know how many hunters it's going to take to do that, but I would say let's wait until the elephant management plan is drafted, but I'd also say there are countries like Mozambique, we can give them elephants, Namibia. You have a lot of plains. We can give you some elephants. So, some elephants can be transported to other countries, so I agree with you that the elephants especially which are up front. I can see the (unintelligible) around, and you will help me disregard.

The (Chavariva) front is great idea. We have a lot of all these elephants in there, and they're destroying the habitat for other wildlife, and it's not good. So, for me, I would say let's sit down. Let's do our science, do our research and come up with accommodations of what to do with the rest of these pieces. Some are recommending sterilization. I don't know that we want to do that route, but it's something that we can debate in our scientific halls and come to policymakers and give you our response.

Man: Any other questions for the professor at this time?

Man: Yes, something I didn't see here, and my own organization, the Conservation Forest, has had a number of projects over the years in Botswana and one I thought was important that I didn't see here was we had arranged a Lions Forever Fund that when there was some issue about whether or not the lion population was decreasing, it provided that every hunter would voluntarily pay \$10,000 for the trophy fee with 30 hunters a year and one per concession, that's \$300,000 to hunting organizations who are going to pay the other \$200,000.

So, \$500,000 a year for five years, and we've began it and banked it and funded a number of projects before in concession Joe's photographic tourism over hunting tourism. I thought you could've have, but that was his choice. I

met with the minister. I met with the director at the time, and both said it was a political decision by in karma who was at that time was general in karma and there was no arguments about it, but I didn't see any of that. But thank you.

(Dr. Joseph Avoya): Yes. It's true. I actually expected that question to come because in my statistic varied firm, I did not include the cats—the lions, the leopards, the cheetahs. That was deliberate, deliberate in the sense that we have not had a sense of for those species of late. I think the figures that we have for 2005 and the like even the 2012, the latest census of wildlife populations, we do not have the correct figures, but if at all I were to take the perceptions of communities and crop areas and livestock areas, that's imposing.

The numbers have gone up of the lions, livestock prediction, the low pads and the like, perceptions, I think, the numbers have gone up, and I don't have any reason to doubt them because the lions are multiplying every year, and they're not being hunted. Maybe if they were forward, we have to do a census for the cats in Botswana and then know how many we have.

Man: Any other questions for the professor. I've got one question. So, in looking at the wildlife management problem with overcapacity, are there really that many choices because to my mind, you are either going to let them starve to death or you're going to trap and transplant them or you're going to cull them. In the world community today, it's pretty hard to get permission to cull 100,000 elephants. It's hard to get anything done, so is by default the human policy going to be to allow 150,000 elephants to starve to death?

(Dr. Joseph Avoya): I don't think it's right to starve the elephants to death, but my proposal, like I said, on their own, maybe those other governments should engage scientists to come and do research, and we do our research and see what can be done.

Like I mentioned, can give Tanzania some animals, we can give you Ghana some animals...

Man: Well, maybe we could bring them to New York and California. With 100,000 Americans...

(Dr. Joseph Avoa): Yes, bingo, yes. So, at the moment, really, I don't have an answer for you except to say we still need to get some conversation, yes.

Man: I know from what I've seen on relocation, it's difficult to find a place that wants to take them much less the cost and expense, et cetera, of trying to relocate them. Professor, thanks for a very interesting and educational speech, enjoyed it quite a lot, and now it's my understanding that we have sort of a surprise presenter, looking forward to hearing make some comments if I can get my phone to open, tell me about him again, Honorable Minister of Basic Education and Chairman of the Botswana Parliamentary Caucus on Conservation.

Man: All right. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, for this opportunity. I will be very brief because of the professor, we go so one of the top government advisor in the country because of his position as that of top message, having government-funded research institution, he says it all. What I'm going to say to you briefly is the current position of the Botswana government, and even this morning, I spoke to the effective president in New York, and I told him, I'm going to make a few remarks before the IWCC consult.

Apart from representing government, I represent the (unintelligible), both north and south of the delta. That's my constituents 209. The members accompanying me are members of Parliament from the northwest region as the professor said correctly so. The gentlemen which always also are the

assistant ministers of the president. They're not all members. Sitting next to me on my left is my assistant and the member of Parliament from Guinea, and the member of Parliament from Maoum is our headquarters in country of tourism have in the country is a man who moved the motion within the Parliament calling for the retain of renting the country, and the motion was agreed upon who deliberately brought the members because we are in agreement with the motion apart from the fact that I personally advise the president on educational matters.

At the same time, I chair the Botswana chapter on parliamentary conservation caucus. That is a branch out of ISCCF USA Congress chapter. The reason why we're in and out of this meeting is because we're representing in our country in both worlds. For the past two days, you were on the other side talking to those who believe non-conceptive approach of conservation is the way, and my team, when they listened to the discussion yesterday, they said, no, this is where we belong. This is where we're supposed to be attending because we are in agreement with what the IWCC is saying. Of course, we are victims of our own good deeds of the country.

We did very well. By the way, most of you have been in the country say the gentlemen here whether it's in Botswana, in north Moremi Game Reserve, Chavani Park and all of the delta. We have done very well as a country to ensure that we conserve our flora and fauna, and Namibia did very well yesterday, but the only thing one of them is that you did not mention is that the CVNM policy, you came to Botswana, and you landed from where, how to ensure that you promote inclusive sustainable conservation, and we want to thank you because you did very well. You landed very well, and you have even mastered more than your teachers, and I want to thank you for that.

Very soon, I will be sending my teams back to you to go and land because you have done very well on that aspect, and mind you, Mr. Chairman, I represent Okavango and part of their conservation in Okavango. That aside, I speak the same language with most of the communities in their conservation speak in my country, we're the same country just divided by the borders. Now, whenever you say that, now that we know that after the suspension, of course, yes, people will say we've banned hunting, but when you look at this budgetary instrument, we talk about suspension, but of course, the suspension is become a ban. What then happened? I don't want to be repetitive. The professor said it all, his phase in the capital of the tourism hub in Botswana. He has seen it with his eyes, they research we've done, on day-to-day experiences what had happened.

The communities are up in arms. If I had time, I was going to play you part of my constituency. One of the men in one of the villages was saying to me, "Next time when you come, you are going to invite your elephants and the constituency to the public meetings" and not as you can see the anger, the frustration from the committees that used to pride themselves in terms of ownership of the natural resources. These have not fell on deaf ears on the government side. The president has made it clear contrary to reports that the biggest problem in Botswana is poaching nor is government our biggest problem is not poaching.

Our biggest problem is human-wildlife conflict. That's our biggest problem that we need to deal with, and the president had started his conversation meetings by addressing the affected communities in the capital of the tourism hub and that's in Maoum. I think correctly so, Professor, it was two weeks back when Maoum with the president. I showed the communities that he has been briefed, he has moved around the region, he has seen the challenges that comes or brought about by the high number of not only elephants, if you are

to get the statistics but as the professor said, almost we have high numbers of a number of species, and the question that confuses one's mind why a blanket suspension of hunting was carried out by government.

That is history. We are now moving forward. The way for what is the president agrees with the communities that there's a challenge, and he has commissioned conservation committees. He had divided his cabinet into cabinet subcommittees, and we have started this past Monday touring the affected areas and consulting scholars, consulting specialists, consulting stakeholders over the issue, and I want to assure you that the writing, of course, is very, very clear that the members from the region, the affected region, we sympathize and we spend, and we are saying to the president hunting has to be brought back as a management tool in the country, not only as a management tool.

We are also looking at hunting as providing or tentative or compulsory or tentative connectivities to the communities themselves that suffer from the human-wildlife conflict. So, in brief, Mr. Chairman, I would be more than happy to respond to questions. Maybe before I do that, I want to agree with the professor when he said—and even the Namibian minister and the director herself when they said conservation cannot be achieved without the communities. It's true I live within those communities. We have deployed, you know, armed forces. We pride ourselves as having one of the world trained forces in the region. We have deployed our forces all over the conflicted area, but we continued to have poaching activities going on the rise.

Why? Because the communities now have become part and parcel of the people who habiting this poachers from within and outside the country. Therefore, I agree totally with the statement that missed division is a strategy that cannot work and at the same time, as the legislators from the area would

not support if we went to the communities to participate, and in Botswana, we're not only talking about participation in terms of job creation only, opportunities only, but we are saying true ownership of the resources themselves, who should own the resources, what percentage in terms of ownership. In terms of, you know, empowerment that tourism brings about, Mr. Chairman.

Therefore, I want to assure the concept here that our consultation, I think it's safe to say because we end up ready to conclude them, and I think we should have had a decision back before end of November this year from what the president say to us. Therefore, we are very clear on that. We agree, but the last thing is we need to be thinking about compensatory alternative economic activities to ensure that communities are bold. Thank you very much.

Man: Thank you, Minister. Appreciate your discussion and your explanation of a lot of what is going on there. I remember that it's being a temporary suspension that was done about four years ago, so hopefully, the discussions will continue, and we'll terminate fairly soon, and get back to business of helping the communities and helping wildlife, but questions for the minister. Yes?

(Ivan): I have more of a comment than a question, and I'd just like to commend the leaders in this room for learning from each other, from seeing examples from their neighbors that really work and working together as a block of Africa, not an individual country to solve the same problems that we're all dealing with, so it's really nice to see that these conversations are happening, that they're happening publicly and that it's for the better of the wildlife. Thank you so much.

Man: Thanks, (Ivan). Other comments, questions? Well, that's a great explanation on what you're doing in Botswana, and with the shows coming up in January, this could be quite timely as far as getting additional revenues to the communities and opportunities for the Botswana citizens.

Man: All right. Thank you. I would have covered the professor on the question that you asked. Now the view is that the carrying capacity would be staked around 60,000 elephants now. We're talking about what's the way forward. Are we going to see government taking a decision driving the elephants or killing them at a go?

No. In that their place, no. We're not going to do that, but at the same time, you know, every time, we've got tons of areas, concessions that we use to be as hunting before, now what we have said now they should be tending to do photographic tourism. Photographic tourism by its own nature is elitist. The questions of that continue to be required to explain is that how were the communities prepared to take part in the photographic tourism? There's very little research unfortunately that we've done as a government to ensure that people are in our communities.

Now, what we are going to do, one was that we are looking at now is to ensure that how safe those concessions, how do we ensure that they're safe so that the elephants can then trust to go back in those woodlands? That's what we're trying to deal with. Likely the committees are going to make those concessions up there.

There are some alternative other provision points there so that the elephants can trust to go back in those areas and to leave the premises on the only water points which is provided by the delta and also promoting the intermediate

which is negative activity in the communities and division, so thank you very much.

Man: Thank you very much.

Man: Thank you, thank you.

Man: (Eric), I'm going to propose we do about a 15-minute biological break at this point, and so if everybody could reconvene here in 15 minutes, we'll get started again.

((Crosstalk))

Man: You can throw presentations on it and print it out somewhere else for (unintelligible) members.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Yes.

Man: Yes if you've got somebody else. Actually I think (Kashanay) or (Moe). Actually (Moe) think kind of keeps them. Okay, okay thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Really enjoyed that. And what a excellent show from (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: So I just - I think their (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: They handed in their lanyards.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Anyway.

Man: Maybe a group discussion.

((Crosstalk))

Man: I don't want to touch it.

((Crosstalk))

Man: The other way is just print out the ones that (unintelligible) already.

((Crosstalk))

Man: We're good.

((Crosstalk))

(Jim): Okay if we can get everybody headed back toward their seats we're going to start again in about three minutes.

((Crosstalk))

(Rose Mendasosa Chicarima): Okay no we can wait (unintelligible).

(Jim): So to advance the slides would just be the spacebar.

Woman: Okay.

Man: Your name, I don't want to butcher your name, it's (Rose Mendasosa).

(Rose Mendasosa Chicarima): (Chicarima).

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Rose Mendasosa Chicarima): Yes (Rose)...

(Jim): (Mendasosa).

(Rose Mendasosa Chicarima): (Rose) yes you can call me (Rose) (unintelligible).

(Jim): (Rosaline).

(Ros Mendasosa Chicarima): (Rosaline Mendasosa) but you can call me (Rose). Everyone call me (Rose) (unintelligible).

(Jim): (Unintelligible).

Woman: Yes thank you so much.

((Crosstalk))

(Jim): Well I just got the text.

((Crosstalk))

(Jim): Okay (Ivan), (Peter), (Chris Hudson) is among the missing. We have an excellent presenter coming up and I want to get a full compliment of the council here. Someone head (Jeff Crane) this direction. And (Chris Hudson) and (Mike Ingram). You all just got here before getting demerit marks.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Jim): The only one missing is (Chris) at the moment.

Man: We got (Peter). (Unintelligible) (Chris).

(Jim): The late (Chris Hudson) is arriving.

Man: He's always breaking (unintelligible). Okay (Chris), nice of you to come.

(Jim): And the state department is here. Okay I wanted to make sure we had a full compliment here. We've had great presentations and we have one coming up that I think is going to be outstanding, explaining everything about Zimbabwe.

(Rose Mendasosa Chicarima) is the Chief Ecologist with Zimbabwe Parks and Wildlife Authority. She oversees research and management across Zimbabwe, Holds a Master of Science Tropical Resource Ecology degree, has in the

recent past service made individual positive findings for lion trophies taken from Zimbabwe that meet the enhancement criteria under 50 CFR 17.32.

Zimbabwe through my knowledge of Africa, well it's been about 30 years now, has always been one of the best managed operations as far as wildlife is concerned. And so it's a pleasure today to have the Chief Ecologist (Rose Chicarima) to present Zimbabwe's thoughts to us.

(Rose Mendasosa Chicarima): Thank you (Jim) for the introduction. You said it all. Firstly I would like to thank the government of the United States of America for the invitation and also for setting up this council. And also for giving us this opportunity to come and present on issues in matters of wildlife that are dear to our heart.

Wildlife is us. We are the people who look after the wildlife. We are the people who live with the wildlife. I'm going to go into my presentation and that cheetah that you see on the screen is a cheetah from the Hwange National Park. It's not from captive operations. This is in the wild, the real wild in Hwange National Park.

Okay this is my presentation outline. And my presentation is going to be divided into six parts. I'm going to look at wildlife governance in Zimbabwe. I'm going to look at the protected areas, I'll also focus on the wildlife areas outside the protected areas and of course I will also focus on wildlife utilization.

And when talking of (unintelligible) wildlife utilization I'm going to focus on two species, the lion and the elephant. I'm also going to look at CAMPFIRE, one of the success stories of community-based nature resource management.

And then at the end I'll also look at other wildlife conservation initiatives that Zimbabwe is undertaking for the conservation of wildlife.

And maybe before I start I want to thank my colleagues from Africa for laying the foundation for us. I'm just going to try and - for the final (unintelligible) thank you.

Okay the Zimbabwe Parks and Wildlife Management Authority is a (unintelligible), it's a quasi-government agency. What this means is that we operate under the parks and wildlife board and the board reports to the Ministry of Environment, Tourism and Hospitality.

And we are now under a new Ministry - I'm sure from setting (unintelligible) September we used to be the Minister of Environment, Water and Climate but in the wisdom of the new president he has decided to join the environment and tourism. And we see this as a very good idea because there's no way you can separate tourism and environment, especially wildlife because wildlife is the basis for tourism.

And the parks - Zimbabwe Parks and Wildlife Management Authority derives its mandate from the Parks and Wildlife Act of Chapter 20:14 is amended but the (unintelligible) 19 of 2001. Before 2001 there was the Department of National Parks which was an arm of the government and I'll explain further in my presentation.

And looking at our acts, it provides and gives us guidelines on sustainable utilization of wildlife, plants and animals, inside and outside the protected areas. The Zimbabwe Parks and Wildlife Management Authority manages the wildlife on behalf of the people of Zimbabwe.

Wildlife is our national heritage and we look at wildlife as a national asset that should be used sustainably. And when looking at wildlife in Zimbabwe we hinge our management on the principle of sustainable utilization and this is what has brought us to where we are today.

And the Authority which is - when referring to the Authority I'm talking about Zimbabwe Parks and Wildlife Management Authority, we do not get any funding from the government. We are an authority that is self-funding. So what it means is that the money that we get from hunting, the money that we get from water activities, the (unintelligible) accommodation, it all goes back to conservation.

And we direct our budgets towards law enforcement and antipoaching which is resource protection. We also look at management plans for the national parks safari areas which gives (unintelligible) and direction through the wildlife. And we'll also look at research and monitoring, hunting, problem animal management and also education awareness and other management activities inside and outside the protected areas.

So when we are say sustainable utilization what are we saying? We are saying wildlife pays for its upkeep. So today if someone comes and have - if someone does an activity that money should go back to conservation. That money is not supposed to go in anyone's pocket or in any organization. It should go back to conservation.

So we do have conservative wildlife conservation and non-conservative in all our wildlife categories. And one notion that I think we need to highlight even before I go deep into my presentation is that for us to be able to sustainably manage our wildlife it's critical to say - I'll just read it as it is, "Critical to sustainable wildlife utilization and management is the notion that wildlife is

an alternative land use option and it has to compete with other uses such as livestock, crops, production, even mining”

So we need to justify why you are using that land for wildlife for the benefit of the people and also for the politicians, the government to support this land use type.

Okay and looking at our protected areas in Zimbabwe, our protected areas which are the parks and estates are divided into national parks. We have 11 national parks in Zimbabwe and in the national parks this is where we drew management and there is no utilization, there is no harvesting, commercial harvesting from the national parks.

And after the national parks we have the safari areas. In the safari areas that's where hunting takes place. And you - I will show you in one map that will follow after this slide, the location of these areas. We also have recreational parks and recreational parks are centered around water bodies.

And then you also have botanical gardens and botanical reserves. Here we are mostly focusing on the plants. In the botanical reserves we have the plants that are not supposed to be utilizing anyway and with - are reserve for the country. And our botanical gardens, these are areas where we can also propagate the endangered plants like the cycads and we also help to propagate and also share around some areas where the species would have been destroyed.

We also have sanctuaries in Zimbabwe. And in sanctuaries we have key species that are managed intensively so that the animals that are managed can also be used to repopulate some areas where the populations would have declined. We have a sanctuary where we do have set for breeding, we also

have inland breeding. All this happens and this is being managed by the Authority.

Okay and here what you see, this is the map of Zimbabwe. And from the map the areas in dark green, these are our national parks. And the areas in light green/yellow, those are the safari areas. And what as you can see, we have - the national park where there is management, this is the (unintelligible) for the animals that will be hunted in the safari areas.

And if you look at Hwange National Park, we also have other hunting areas like the (unintelligible) we share the boundary with Zambezi. We also have Kazuma. And we also have - in another map that I will show you, we also have our CAMPFIRE areas and community areas that are also sharing the boundary with the national parks and also with the safari areas.

Okay, and for wildlife outside parks and estates, we have areas that are not protected by the government but are protected by private people like in the Buby Valley and the Save Valley Conservancy. I would said in Buby Valley Conservancy, this is a closed wildlife population. This is owned privately but we do assist in the management looking at the quota setting and they also have rhinos. And as the government we also oversee that.

And in Buby Valley this is one area in the whole of Africa with the highest density of lions. This is one success story of our conservation in Zimbabwe. Buby Valley Conservancy and Save Valley Conservancy used to be cattle ranching areas. And due to the drought that happened in Zimbabwe the owners decided that we are going to stop cattle ranching and you are going to go into wildlife conservation.

And these are success stories because we are saying that you can move away from cattle ranching or cropping and also living and sustain livelihoods through wildlife conservation. We also have small private land where we also have wildlife.

And we also have communal areas. These are areas again that are near wildlife areas and the communities themselves, the local people have set aside lands where wildlife can be utilized to sustain their livelihoods.

From the previous map that I showed you, if we look at outside (unintelligible) Hwange National Park which is the biggest park that we have, we have communities in the Chilojo area and also in the Binga area that benefit from wildlife.

And in some areas we have a hard edge between the communal area and the national parks or safari areas. And people have set aside - they've decided to say that, "In this area we are going to set - to leave a certain area where we are going to utilize wildlife." And this has been a success.

Okay we also have forestry areas that surround some of the protected areas and they also have wildlife in these areas. And so we are saying in total the parks and estates, the private land that is wildlife covers about 26% of the total land area in Zimbabwe. And this is also, again, it's a population of about 15 million people in Zimbabwe.

Now we are now focusing on wildlife utilization. It was said earlier by my colleague from Botswana, hunting is a conservation tool. That is scientifically done with robust monitoring. It will assist in the conservation of wildlife species. We are here today talking about wildlife because we have been sustainably managing our wildlife. With countries that have been doing

preservation they don't have any wildlife to talk about today because their populations have declined.

So trophy or safari hunting or commercial hunting is key when it comes to sustainable utilization in Zimbabwe. And again as said by my colleague, trophy hunting is selective hunting. It's not just going into the bush and then you start hunting. It's selective hunting of male species that no longer could contribute to the production in any (unintelligible) or pride. And again this is something that is strictly monitored.

And in Zimbabwe quotas are set and managed through an adaptive management system. What does this mean? We are saying today we are going to set a quota. We are going to monitor what we have harvested and also the remaining population to ensure that whatever is being done doesn't have a negative impact on the remaining population.

So every year when we do our quota setting process we do a rigorous monitoring and also make recommendations for approval. And we are also seeing that for all hunting of all key species, we are talking about the lion, we are talking elephant, the leopard is strictly monitored. So much that when a hunt is being conducted someone from the Parks and Wildlife from the Authority needs to monitor these hunts.

And this started when there was one lion incident that happened and we said that we need to be sure that whatever is being harvested is of the right age and all the permits are there. So every time when any hunt is ongoing we monitor the hunt.

We also have an online system for all hunted trophies and we monitor and approve each hunt if it happens so that we remove all loopholes when it comes

to illegal harvesting. And all hunting stations where - in all areas where hunting is done, all trophies are measured. We monitor the trophies and this also reflects on what - on the remaining populations.

If the populations are - the trophy size is declining we'll also (unintelligible) also see what is happening to the population and you could also end up reducing the quota. And for all key species in Zimbabwe like the elephant, lion, cheetah and the wild dog, we have species-specific manage plans.

And I would say for the elephant we do have a current, very current, very new elephant management plan that was approved in 2015. And when talking about the elephant in Zimbabwe we want to acknowledge the partnerships that we have with conservation folks because they assisted us and they funded the Elephant Management Plan from all the way from until the plan was removed. We really want to thank conservation folks for assisting us on that.

And then what we've also done on elephants, one of the key recommendations was that we should have a species-specific coordinators for the species. So for the elephant we have an elephant coordinator. So what this person does is to monitor the implementation of the elephant management plan. And in the four regions that we have, we have the Sebungwe, Zambezi Valley, South East Lowveld and the Northwest Matabeleland, we have found what we call the elephant management committees.

And in this committees we monitor and assist, looking at resource protection, looking at everything that has to do with elephant management, the poaching and also the movement of the elephant in each region. And this is reported to the national committee. And I would say the elephant, as we are speaking today, the elephant management in Zimbabwe I think is one of the best.

We also have a lion management plan and the lion management that we are currently using was done in 2006 and we have recently got some funding from one of the local NGOs and we are hoping that by November would have reviewed and updated the lion management plan.

We also have a crocodile management plan and recently we reviewed and updated our cheetah and wild dog and it was also recently approved by our board. And starting next year we'll be implementing some of the activities that has been recommended for the cheetah and wild dog.

And as a country and also as the scientific authority of CITES we will also conduct the non-detriment findings, the NDF for all the key species. We have done the NDF as required by CITES and we will also share these documents with our colleagues and also with the US Fish and Wildlife Services is also is a requirement by the US government.

So what we do with the NDF is we assess the impact of trade or utilization of the species. And you also assess the impact of and the removal of the species from the remaining populations in the wild. And also it would be good to mention that every moment we are carrying out a (unintelligible). We hope it will be done before we begin the rainy season and it will be in a few weeks. And again that's how it will be shared with everyone, okay.

Now I'm going to explain the quota setting process. For you to be able to come and hunt in Zimbabwe you need to have a quota approved for each specific hunting area. And as the scientific authority we do conduct the quota setting workshops in all the regions in Zimbabwe. And in these workshops, this is a participatory approach. And what we mean here is we write (unintelligible) quotas with anything to do with hunting in Zimbabwe. We are

looking at the parks and estates, the private funds, the (unintelligible) area, the conservancies and the rural district councils.

We also have presentations from the custodians who are the landowners and they present on their wildlife population estimates, they present on the security, the poaching activities, the diseases, the translocations and the general management of the areas.

And besides the presentations that they make we also do (unintelligible) on areas where hunting takes place. And these recommendations are also used during the quota setting process.

So this is a chart that shows what we do. So what you are seeing is we have data from the aerial surveys and the ground surveys, we have the trophy quality data, we have stakeholder information and also ground survey data. And what we do now is triangulation workshop, there's participation, there's visualization and analysis of the trend. And from there we have the proposed quota.

So this quota is in a proposal in such a way that when from the quota setting it comes to the wildlife authority. And when we have all the data from the area, we then now analyze the data in relation to the hunting area, in relation to the eco region. And then the quote is set and then we submit to the director general, he recommends and it is approved by the minister. When it's been approved by the minister it will now go back to utilization.

So in setting quotas what do we consider? One of the things that we consider as the CITES national quotas. For elephant with a quota of 500; for crocodile we have 200; for leopards we have 500; for cheetah we have 50. Those are the

species where we have a quota. So what it means that if we are going to set any quota it should not exceed what we have agreed and set with CITES.

So again we look at the national (unintelligible) latest (unintelligible) results and also (unintelligible) local level. These are the ground counts, these are the water hole counts and also the 24-hour counts. So all this data that - we use all this data when setting quotas.

We also use data from research and monitoring. What we mean here is besides the researchers that we have within the Wildlife Authority we also have external researchers who come from all over to come and assist us in research. And the results that they present to us, we take those results, especially when it has to do with hunting, and take that into considering. So even as we are setting our quotas we also consider the result.

We also look at the size of the property in relation to the species that is being applied for. We also look at the distribution, again, of the species and that also relates to the national aerial survey results. And we also look at the management regime of the property to also see if you can safely or sustainably harvest any number or any species from the number that you have. We also look at the sustainable (unintelligible) species specific growth - population growth.

And again a continuation of the factors that we consider, we will also look at illegal (unintelligible) which is poaching. We have a utilization database at (unintelligible) level. So any utilization legal or illegal, it has to be entered into a database. And from this database then we can safely say that from all the harvest that has happened in a population with a legal or illegal, this number can be safely harvested from that population.

We're also looking at community quotas. We also consider human-wildlife conflict hot spots. We look at community benefits and also conflict mitigation. And we also introduce an age best quota setting for carnivores. I'll elaborate more on that in the next few slides.

We also look at trophy quality. We also look at trends. We look at hunting effort and also success. For example when someone comes to Zimbabwe for a lion hunt for 21 days, how much time does it take you to harvest a lion. And you have got that lion, how many days did you take? And what's the trophy quality? We are looking at the size of the trophy.

In addition to all that we also have sustainable (unintelligible) percentages that has been recommended to us by WWF that we will also use during the quota setting process. So you see whenever we need to do anything we consult with our stakeholders and everything that will be approved it will have the concurrence of our stakeholders.

I'm going now to look at the lion case. And I'm very happy to present to you this because the lion management, this is my baby. I'm a large carnivore person. And looking - talking of lions and lion conservation, this is dear to me.

We introduced the age best quota setting for lions in 2013. And we are doing this with assistance and taking advice from (Pantera). And this is an implementation of research results of a set of lions that was done. In the research it was discovered that if we are going to harvest lions that are four years and below, five years or (unintelligible) years and below is going to have a negative impact because if you remove a male that is four years, it's just getting into reproduction.

And at most (unintelligible) and if you remove that lion from that pride there's going to be increased infanticide and there's not going to be any population growth in that lion population. So here we are recommending that the minimum age of a lion that can be safely harvested from any population, at least it should be seven. When we are (unintelligible) but it should be - the minimum should be seven and above. And I'll show you some of the results from our slides.

And why are we doing this? We need to achieve sustainability of lion hunting. We need to - we had a desire to achieve a high quality for trophies. And also one of the reasons why we had embarked on this is there's a growing pressure from (unintelligible) nations from evidence of non-detriment of harvesting of the lions. And also one of the reasons that we had to also do this was international scrutiny on African lion trophy hunting.

Okay so this is a point system that we have developed. We are saying that if you hunt a lion, like if you have a quota of three or more, you harvest a lion that is above six years, you get this point. If you hunt - if you have no trophy, like, if you look at the second one, no trophy, if - you get points if you harvest. And these points will then be calculated for you to get a quota for the next hunting season.

If you hunt a lion that is more than six years you'll be rewarded. If you hunt a lion that is four years and below you'll be punished. And if you are in a hunt, you decide to say that this lion that I'm about to harvest is below age and you make that conservation decision in the field, you'll be rewarded for that. So this is what we've been implementing since 2013. And it is one of our success stories as we see that it has yielded positive results.

So from 2013 when we started lion aging, you see that about 50% of the lions that we have harvested were less than four years. What it meant was that we were killing the lion population in Zimbabwe. There was no growth. And then when we got to 2015, 2016, there was an improvement.

So what you see now here is the lions that we are harvesting, the population is now stable and in some areas it's increasing. And the trophies that we are harvesting are above six years. And this is good as we can see that in all the hunting areas there's a (unintelligible) to it increasing lion population.

Okay now I'm going to look at the elephant case. And (unintelligible) the second largest population after Botswana. From the 2014 aerial survey that we did, the great elephant census, we have about 82,000 elephants inside the protected areas. And we have about 1000 elephants outside protected areas with a population, high population in the Northwest Matabeleland and in the South East Lowveld.

And while Zimbabwe has a quota of 500 I would say for the past five years we have hunted very few and that has had any - I'll show you in the next few slides, end the harvest in any significance. In 1900 we had about 4000 elephants and in between 1960s and 1989 we did culling, heavy culling of about 45,000 elephants.

And the reason why we're doing culling at that time was to try and reduce the elephant population. But as of today there is no culling and the population is increasing. And also culling was done to avoid the loss to biodiversity as the elephant has a major impact on the woody plants which are the woody trees.

And again I would say the reason why culling was done at that time, there was value for culling because people would be able to sell their ivory and get that

money to fund conservation. Even as we are talking today if we are going to do culling there'd be no benefit to the elephant because you cannot sell the ivory. We just put them in the stores.

And also from the studies that have been done I know in Zimbabwe in the Gonarezhou National Park and the Kruger, from the elephants that were there when culling was done, it showed that the elephants became aggressive. So from a scientific point, wouldn't encourage culling. So when we say Zimbabwe has a CITES export quota of 500 it means we can export 1000 (unintelligible) from Zimbabwe.

And looking at hunting, we are seeing hunting (unintelligible) are very low. And the impact is very minimum in the overall population rates. And as population has declined in the past few years due to the import suspension. And I would like to also to mention that poaching of elephants has been drastically reduce in the past two years. And earlier between January and June we recorded very, very low numbers of elephant poaching in some of our hot spots.

And then just looking at some of the (unintelligible), what we are seeing is being 2010 and 2013, 228 elephants were harvested. This is 0.276 of the total elephant population that we have. If you go to 2014, 174 elephants were harvested. This is 0.210% of the total elephant population that we have. And if you look at 2017, 157 elephants were harvested which is 0.19% of the total population. What does this mean?

All we are saying is as much as we have a CITES quota of 1000, we are not hunting to meet the CITES quota. We are hunting sustainably through an adaptive management. We can only harvest these animals - from these

animals that are being harvested we can safely maintain the elephant population.

But I'm sure one of the things that I would also want to mention is that following the ban that we had, it disturbed our - two things, because when this ban came it was unannounced so we didn't get a notice, we did not plan for it.

And in that year there was a lot of poaching (unintelligible) especially in areas in the Northwest Matabeleland because this is an area where we have the highest number of elephants. And people expect to get something from living with the wildlife. And (unintelligible) they don't get we will all have problems. I'm going to give another slide on human and wildlife conflict that will also help us to tie in the banning and the impact on wildlife conservation.

Now I'm going to look at the communities. My friend from Namibia did a great job on presenting on the communities and I'm not going to say very much because I'm sure as we all know, CAMPFIRE started in the late 1980s and but before we had CAMPFIRE in Zimbabwe we used to we have what we called the (Windfall), the (Windfall) and the (Yama) Project.

What this meant was the local people wanted meat. So in the past they would harvest meat and take to the communities but we saw that it was not sustainable. That's why we went to CAMPFIRE.

CAMPFIRE is the Authority's baby. And when CAMPFIRE was started it was funded by the USAID. And USAID helped us to set up CAMPFIRE but I'm sure what I would want to mention, when they left I'm sure in the late 90s they began - we began to have some changes in our management, in the government and they just left. And CAMPFIRE was success because we had a partner who we're working and a partner who was supporting us.

And this - the area shaded in red, like this part in red, these are the districts that we have. And these are the - there in the map we are showing protected areas and also the CAMPFIRE districts. So you see in most of our CAMPFIRE areas are in areas where there is wildlife with the national parks and also with the safari areas.

And also it would be good to mention that in the national parks and safari areas that we have these areas are not fenced. So wildlife freely move between the national parks and safari areas in the communities.

And then the CAMPFIRE program, while we have 58 administrative districts in Zimbabwe, we have 19 districts that are actively involved in CAMPFIRE and we have about 200,000 households that actively participates in this program. And another 200,000 that benefit indirectly from the social services.

As highlighted by my colleagues, area looking at communities, we are seeing that (unintelligible) these people who are living with the wildlife but when there's a clinic, where there's a school, everyone from the district can come and benefit from these resources. So say CAMPFIRE contributes to the protection of a large number of land which is being used for wildlife and other natural resources.

Then looking at revenue, the money issues here. There was a review - a CAMPFIRE review that was done in 2002. And the review recommended that 55% of income be allocated to the communities, 26% go to the (unintelligible) council and then that's supported through the CAMPFIRE activities, and 15% goes to the administration and 4% to the (unintelligible) of the CAMPFIRE Association.

And here we are also seeing that in our (unintelligible) we have a rural district council and all communal areas that fall under the Rural District Council which falls under the Ministry of Local Government. And what they - we are seeing here is the Rural District Council makes the decisions for the communities who are living with the wildlife.

And recently we did a CAMPFIRE review that was funded by EU and it was recommended that we should devote decision-making to village level. And this is one of the major recommendations from the EU review. And at this moment the documents will be approved by the ministry and after it's been approved they will come back to us for implementation.

And then in 2007 going back to the presentation, it was recommended that the safari operator - the communities should open bank accounts so that safari operators deposits money direct for the communities under a direct deposit payment system. This has been successful in some areas but it has not been successful in some areas and we are hoping that with the review that has been ongoing will make sure that this would be corrected so that the people who are living with wildlife benefit directly.

(Unintelligible) 2013 I would say that CAMPFIRE income is declined. And the peak of our revenue from CAMPFIRE was in 1999 where we used to receive about 10 million and in 2014 the money dropped from about 2.3 in 2013 to about 1.8.

And we think that this drop in the revenue is a direct impact of the ivory import ban by United States of America because when looking at communities American clients constitutes (unintelligible) percent. So we're saying for all the hunts that are taking place in the communal areas, that

(unintelligible) percent of the hunters they come from the US. So if there's a change or any disturbance in the market it has a direct impact.

And then income from hunting in some of the CAMPFIRE areas we are seeing the elephant - we get more revenue from the elephant followed by the buffalo, leopard, hippo, crocodile and lion in that order. So if there's any change or anything that disturbs the elephant hunting it has a direct impact on the livelihood.

This has a direct, very direct impact on the people especially in the northeast and the southeast that depend so much on the elephant hunting. Because we know that if one elephant is hunted it will help to sustain livelihoods and lives for the next months to come.

So when looking at the over-expenditure at what level, what is the money being used for. We see that most of the money is going to the social services. Here we're talking about the clinics, we are talking about the schools, we are talking about the water. And then some of the money goes to the food security, direct cash benefits and then also assistance to wildlife victims.

In areas where people live with the wildlife people are attacked by crocodiles, by hippos and some people are maimed, some people are injured and also some people are killed. And the money that people get is also supposed to support these benefits.

I think I also want to mention that in Zimbabwe we do not compensate for any loss. If your livestock or your crop is damaged by wildlife we do not compensate. We believe that if people are able to tolerate wildlife when there's any utilization of any form, they'll be able to benefit directly from the

result. And we also think that if you are going to start having compensations it could not be sustainable.

Okay and then also over here I just put in these figures so that you could also see the impact of human-wildlife conflict in some of the CAMPFIRE (unintelligible). We have picked just as a few. We have (unintelligible) building materials. These areas are in the northwest, some of them are in the southeast and some of them are in the Zambezi Valley. These are some of the key CAMPFIRE areas.

And we are saying between 2010 and 2015 there's a lot of damage that has been happening by - being done to crops and also to livestock. So when looking at elephants, hippo and buffalos, they've destroyed about 9342 hectares of land, of crops. And when looking at the figures here we are seeing roughly between 300kg per hectare to 180 per ton. We are looking at 600kg per hectare which is about 180 per ton.

So the loss in money terms is between 504 to about 1 million. And also looking at livestock killed we are looking at the cattle, the goats and the sheep that has been killed by lions, leopard, crocodile and hyena. So lion death is 867 and hyena here takes the cubs. They've killed about 2371.

And then looking at the money terms, how much is that? We are looking for cattle. A cattle a head is between 400 and 700 and for small livestock, between 75 and 125. And we are talking of figures that between, for cattle, between 500,000 to 1 million again. For the small livestock to from about 100,000 to about 300,000.

And when looking at human life losses, between 2010 and 2017 we have lost about - we have lost 133 people due to wildlife-related issues. And here, what

are we saying here? We are saying this is the loss. When talking of livestock in our culture, livestock is related to wealth. If you - when you have a head of 15 cattle, when you have a head of 100 cattle you are someone who's wealthy in an African community.

But just imagine when a hyena or a lion comes, they just destroy your bank. This is how bad it is. And all we are saying is when a lion comes we try to have measures to translocate the lions, to try and scare away the animals but in the event that the certain lion has been collared and has been observed it's a recurring problem, at times you need to put down the animal. So this is some of the issues that we live with. And we need hunters, we need people to come in and hunt so that these people will be compensated in some way.

So in this that we do we are saying the communities are also involved in wildlife management but in which way? In the communities they have what they call wildlife community resources manager or monitors. And these monitors are employed by the communities. They also help to monitor the movement of the lion, of the - of all the wildlife species in the communities. And also the Rural District Council also employ CAMPFIRE officers who also assist in wildlife-related issues.

And then looking at benefits. After all this, after we've done, what are the benefits for the communities? The people who are living with the wildlife, we are saying we have revenue that is received that helps to directly affect the cost of living with the wildlife. And most communities invest in infrastructure which has some long-term benefits for their children. We are looking at the clinics, looking at the health, we are looking at the schools and also grinding mills.

And some communities have drilled boreholes, they've constructed roads, they've put up fences in some of the areas to - especially in their gardens so that wildlife does not come. Some people have (unintelligible) and also direct (unintelligible) of drought relief food. Because in the map that I've shown you of Zimbabwe, in areas where we have our protected areas these are the drier parts of the country.

And also children benefit directly from living with wildlife because if their school is built in a community it reduces the walking distance. In some areas children fail to go to school because the distance is too long and, again, there will be incidents of buffalos, elephants in the road.

So in some areas where they do not have schools, some kids not even go to school. But from areas where people are benefitting from CAMPFIRE proceeds, some of the communities have been able to build schools. They have also been able to pay school fees for their children.

And again (unintelligible) by my colleague from Namibia, communities benefit from having meat because an animal is harvested the client only can take the trophy and all the meat goes to the local communities. And with this meat they dry it and they do last them even for a year. They have that source of protein that also helps them to sustain themselves.

And also when we have problem animal management in communities, they benefit from the sale of the hides. Of course we cannot talk about the ivory, of course we cannot sell at the moment but if we're able to sell, the money that we get from the sale of ivories and hides from problem animal management it goes back to the communities.

And then what are the benefits to the wildlife? The benefits to wildlife is if we get revenue from hunting, the money goes back out to conservation. The money is used for (unintelligible) protection, management and enforcement. They're also used for operate anti-poaching regional anti-poaching and also community participation directly and also indirectly.

I think here I also want to highlight that as much as we have this benefit, we also have some major challenges especially in the Northwest Matabeleland. Here we - in the Northwest Matabeleland with the Hwange National Park, the Zambezi and the Kazuma, these areas are very dry. So what we do here, we harvest water from the ground and we have boreholes that needs to be sustained.

We have boreholes that are powered by solar and at times elephants destroy - elephants and baboons destroy the solar panels (unintelligible) areas we also have diesel engines. But we need to sustain this population and here that's a (unintelligible) that you see here. They are at a watering hole and this will be in the dry season.

We also have (unintelligible) modification by elephant in the Hwange National Park. When you - with the elephant you see those shrubs that you see, they used to be mopani woodland. That used to be mopani woodland but that has been transformed by the elephant. So those are the realities of living with wildlife.

And then as a country we are also going into other wildlife conservation initiatives so that we conserve our wildlife. And we have core management in Gonarezhou National Park we (unintelligible) in (unintelligible). There we also have (unintelligible) foundation. They are coming into assist in the conservation of wildlife.

We are also establishing community conservancies. This is a concept that we didn't have. We used to have our CAMPFIRE areas and our communal areas but this is a new concept that we are introducing. And we have - in here we are being funded by (Fow) and also WWF.

We also have a photographic tourism in some of the hunting areas, for example in (unintelligible) it used to be one of our big hunting areas but we are now in a joint venture and it's going to probably used for hunting and also for photographic tourism.

We also have (unintelligible) set quota participation in the Chizarira (unintelligible) support local. We also have local and international NGOs. And Zimbabwe's also focusing on the landscape approach. We are now being involved in the Transboundary Initiative and the Transfrontier Conservation Areas. Zimbabwe's pursuing six TCA initiatives which are at various stages.

We have the GLTP, which is the Great Limpopo Transfrontier Park Conservation Area where we have South Africa, Mozambique and Zimbabwe. This is at an advanced stage. We also have the (KAZA), K-A-Z-A. This is one - I think one of the successful initiatives that we have. We have Botswana, we have Namibia, Angola, we have Zambia, Zimbabwe. We have about six countries.

And in these regions we have the highest number of elephants, we have buffalos, we have cheetahs. And we have very exciting collaborations that are ongoing which will help, again, in the conservation of wildlife. And we (unintelligible) (Manimani) and the lower Zambezi, and (Zimoza) which are also in different stages of implementation.

And that's just a map to show some of the initiatives that we are having. And it is good that we are going to this transboundary wildlife management because it allows for collaboration and it promotes cooperation among countries. And this I would say one of our success stories southern Africa.

And then this is the impact of the banning of hunting in illegal trades. The banning of hunting in illegal trade contributes the extinction of the species. I've put up this slide, I'm sure some people think it's gross but I put this intentionally so that people know that even if you are sitting somewhere making a decision for Africa, this is the result.

There you see an elephant that has been poisoned. You see a vulture that fed on the elephant that has died. And that is a rhino. We've banned - it's good. Yes people say it's good we are trading in rhino but does there's that reality that we have underground. That life, that rhino is no more. If they're not able to (unintelligible) be able to replace it. Those are the realities of some of the decisions that are made.

And again in conclusion, what do we need in Zimbabwe? Zimbabwe needs partners and supporters to conserve its wildlife. We - yes we want you all to come, we want you to assist us so that we keep and sustain our wildlife for the benefit of future generations. Thank you so much.

(Jim): (Rose) thanks for a great presentation. I know I have several questions if I could ask them? (Rose) could we ask you a few questions? I know I have several and I'm sure others on the council do.

You made a phenomenal presentation and looking back at the numbers, you have a CITES quota of 500 elephants per year. In 2013 you took 284, 2014, 174. Looked like 284 was the high. You have 83,000 elephants. You have a

carrying capacity of that 35 to 40,000. I was at Hwange National Park two years ago and they were estimating about 50,000 elephants with a carrying capacity of only about 15, 15 to 20 there.

(Rose Mendasosa Chicarima):           Fifteen-thousand yes.

(Jim):                   I don't think any of us consider sport hunting and conservation hunting to be a population control. We consider it to be a means of a country getting the financial resources to do some population control but how in the world do you plan to get from 83,000 to a reasonable carrying capacity?

(Rose Mendasosa Chicarima):           Thank you Chair for the question. I think as a country we would want to do culling at some point if we are going to get the benefits that comes with the culling. At the same time would want to do internal translocation of elephants.

At the moment like - in my presentations we have an increase in elephant population in the northwest and the southeast. But from the 2014 aerial surveys it showed that there was a decline in the Zambezi Valley and the Sebungwe.

So what we are doing at the moment, we will be moving about 150 elephants from the South East Lowveld to the Hurungwe safari area which is in the Zambezi Valley. And we are hoping if we are able to do some internal translocations, we'd be able to distribute the populations but at the same time the population continues to grow.

So maybe at some point if we are going to get some benefits from the ivory then maybe we'd consider culling but at the moment we have this problem.

(Jim): Thank you, and another question, looking at the graph up there a moment ago, I was amazed, over 133 human deaths and animal-human conflicts. And having been in some very remote areas I certainly understand the human-animal conflicts but looking at it also the rate, 167 livestock deaths but the main culprit on it appeared to be hyenas. More than twice as much as lions, leopard, everything else. And I was a little surprised at that.

I guess I expected lions and leopards to be the most but hyenas were the worst. But it readily points out that in remote areas the human-animal conflicts are a major problem. And without the humans having some benefit from the animals being there they're going to do what they can to eliminate the animals.

(Rose Mendasosa Chicarima): Certainly.

(Jim): So I commend you for everything you're doing in Zimbabwe. And proper management of wildlife.

(Rose Mendasosa Chicarima): Thank you.

(Jim): And thank you very much for the presentation. Anybody else, questions, comments? (Rowina)?

(Rowina): Hi good morning, thank you so much for coming to (unintelligible) Washington and joining our meeting. I had a question on one of your slides that was mentioning about the US ivory ban and that that being somehow correlated with some of the decrease in revenues and the hunting regulations or rulings.

I just wanted to clarify, I think that the US ivory ban is consistent with some of the - it's not inconsistent rather, with the trophy imports. And I just - I saw that those were sort of conflated. I wanted to disentangle that for a second. So - because the US has been such a leader in combating wildlife trafficking and that's mostly what I work on at state department.

So the ivory ban is that the US has and put in place as well as China and other countries. The domestic ivory ban is not the same thing as how we deal with our trophy imports on elephants.

(Rose Mendasosa Chicarima): Sorry maybe there was - it should be the trophy ban for elephants, not the ivory. No, no, no, no.

(Rowina): Okay thank you.

(Rose Mendasosa Chicarima): The trophy ban, yes.

(Rowina): Thank you, I appreciate that.

(Rose Mendasosa Chicarima): Thank you.

(Jim): Okay...

(Chris): I have two questions.

(Jim): Go ahead (Chris).

(Chris): Okay first I'd like to talk about lions. You said they were your baby and I'm confused because several years back Zimbabwe parks prohibited issuing export permits for female lions. And I was curious if you could help us with

what was the biological or scientific reason for that ban because what it seemed to have resulted in, in a number of areas in Zimbabwe where they're at capacity with lions, it ended up with the destruction of a lot of female lions of no value whatsoever.

And so was there any scientific or management basis for that ban in place? And is there a possibility that we could reverse that ban, put them back on export quota so that they would have an export sport hunting value?

(Rose Mendasosa Chicarima): Thank you, the ban on the female - well I won't say it's a ban but we've stopped the hunting of females in the - in some of the safari areas because the populations were declining, especially in the Zambezi Valley. But at the moment we are only issuing permits to Buby Valley Conservancy.

The reason why we are issuing to Buby Valley Conservancy is because of their high lion population numbers. So we are allowing the export for female trophies only from Buby Valley Conservancy at the moment.

(Chris): Right and am I correct in that all of those lions at the Buby Valley Conservancy have grown out of a trophy hunting business model over the last 25 years?

(Rose Mendasosa Chicarima): Yes.

(Chris): How many lions were in Buby in 1990 or the year 2000?

(Rose Mendasosa Chicarima): In the year 2000, I know when they started they had 17 lions. When they started they have 17 lions they used to stalk. And at the

moment they're talking about more than 1000, maybe (unintelligible) on that, 450 years.

But when they started they had 17 lions and today we are talking of 450 lions. And we are talking of a closed population. They do have a (unintelligible) proof fence so the lions will not be able to go out because of the - and also it's surrounded by communities so we can safely harvest them from a closed population which is Buby Valley Conservancy.

(Chris): Thank you, so the second question I have is two days ago a member of Congress submitted a bill here in the United States called the Cecil Act and a provision of that would to outlaw forever the import of elephant and trophy - and lion trophies from Zimbabwe. No American can possess them.

And I'm curious do you know - I've just read about it this morning and I was curious, what would - I think one of your slide said 75% of the hunters in Zimbabwe come from the United States and so if it was not as a part of the implementation of our Endangered Species Act, that there was this new legislation designed to stop the import of these trophies.

What would your reaction be from a management standpoint of them parks? Because it looks to me like your entire program of getting the benefit of this wildlife to the communities -- at least 75% of it -- depends on American hunters.

And so what would be affective -- this kind of legislation -- be in Zimbabwe in your management plans?

(Rose Mendasosa Chicarima): I think the impact would be very negative. Because -- as I said in my presentation -- most of the hunters come from America. And if

those people do not come to hunt in Zimbabwe there (unintelligible) use a revenue in reduced benefits to the communities.

Yes. Yes. There could be other markets. But they're not as big as America. And that would have an impact.

I don't know maybe if I need one to (unintelligible).

(Chris): I think you're exactly right. Thank you very much.

Man: (Rose) (unintelligible)...

(Chris): (John)?

Man: Oh sorry. Are you finished, sir?

(Chris): (John)?

Man: Oh.

(Chris): (Unintelligible)?

Man: Yes. (Unintelligible).

(Chris): (John)?

Man: You know, I'm a serious investor in Zimbabwe as a conservation people. So I have too many questions, but let me ask you one.

You said that there was 200,000 direct participants in the campfire program. If I recall right (WWF)s figures and they've been a very important partner in campfire. Or is that 95% of revenue for those people (unintelligible) supported hunting and that 70% came from (Eltonhigh). Of your revenue are those 200,000 families?

Now - and I think you have 2.6 million people. I think there's a new data that there's seven people, not five people in a family. If 777,000 families...

(Rose Mendasosa Chicarima): Yes.

Man: ...the program - do you consider this program a success?

(Rose Mendasosa Chicarima): So in the campfire...

Man: A hunter base campfire program.

(Rose Mendasosa Chicarima): Yes. Certainly...

Man: I...

(Rose Mendasosa Chicarima): ...I do. Certainly.

Man: (Rose) -- once again -- thanks for a great program. As (Chris) has mentioned legislation filed -- et cetera -- it's bothersome to me when the summoning Congress think they know more about managing...

(Rose Mendasosa Chicarima): Yes.

Man: ...Africa than Africans who are trained and they own the job like you.

(Rose Mendasosa Chicarima): Yes.

Man: So thanks again for coming and presenting to us.

I would like for the...

(Rose Mendasosa Chicarima): (Unintelligible).

Man: ...council to gather here in front. We'll get a picture with (Rose).

(Rose Mendasosa Chicarima): Okay.

Man: And we're going to break for lunch. We'll be back here for the presentation starting at one. And (Eric) has some important announcement.

Man: Just to remind everyone...

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: ...we have the signup sheet we'll be collecting right after lunch. So if you're interested in speaking up please do so.

And members of the council will go out this front door here to the elevators and we'll have people take us to the second floor where lunch is waiting for us.

Man: But let's get our picture here with (Rose)...

Man: Right.

Man: ...before we do so.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Thank you.

Man: Thank you. So you're betting at one.

Man: (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Can I change - the presentation is on the (unintelligible) modified in the interim. Is it possible to override it or something?

Man: We can't connect anything external through this.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man 7 I have my laptop.

Man: Is it (FON)?

Man: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Oh. Thank you. (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: I hear you.

Woman: How are you (unintelligible).

Man: So - and you're welcome to...

Man: (Unintelligible). How do we get into (unintelligible) onto...

Man: Well I could put it on (unintelligible).

Man: Oh right.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: So I (unintelligible) I'm just going to see how this thing works  
(unintelligible).

Man: Yes.

Man: That's your...

Man: I guess so. (Unintelligible) presentation.

Man: Yes.

Man: (Unintelligible) emailed to, but not dated (unintelligible) in one of the email  
(unintelligible) outdated (unintelligible).

Man: Yes.

Man: And also sitting the (unintelligible) yesterday I realized (unintelligible) I  
(unintelligible) might not be knocking the nail on the head with our visitation.  
I wasn't sure (unintelligible) change it (unintelligible).

Mm Maybe I should leave it to them.

Man: Mr. (Mommer)?

Man: Yes.

Man: Are we going to talk today?

Man: We are.

Man: Great.

Man: Yes. Lucky. Lucky. Yes.

Man: (Unintelligible) away.

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible) chat with you too as well (unintelligible).

Man: Yes.

Man: Okay. So...

((Crosstalk))

Man: ...(unintelligible)...

Man: Just tell me when and where. I just...

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Okay. You know, like, back at the end of this hall there's a (unintelligible).  
We're all set up inside...

Man: Okay.

Man: ...there. Whoever wants to go first...

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: I think we have...

Man: You leaving?

Man: ...(unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: Yes. (Unintelligible).

Man: I'm (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: I'm not (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Yes. It's only because I knew...

Man: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Man: ... (unintelligible)...

Man: Yes.

Man: ...(unintelligible).

Man: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible) friggen lost this morning. Jesus...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: ...this town of yours is big, man.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible) where do you plug the thing in? I don't know (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Oh. I unplugged it. I...

((Crosstalk))

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: Yes.

Man: I'm going to get (Eric) over here to go ahead and just put mine in there, so I don't have to mess with it while we're...

((Crosstalk))

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: Yes. I didn't see any...

Man: Yes.

Man: ...sort of various (unintelligible).

Man: It must be.

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Yes. Well I wouldn't mess with it. Let's (unintelligible) him to...

Man: Yes. And (unintelligible) record the...

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: ...backup (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible) where did he go?

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: He didn't...

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible)...

Man: ...where did he go?

Man: ...(unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible) there we go. Okay.

Man: Ready?

Man: One more (unintelligible).

Man: Ready?

Man: (Unintelligible) getting a (unintelligible).

Man: There you go. (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible) appreciate it.

Man: (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Thanks (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Yes. Yes.

Man: (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Woman: (Unintelligible)

Man: (Unintelligible) your mom.

Woman: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: You didn't have to work.

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: No problem. (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: Thank you. Thank you (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Oh. No wonder. It goes (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible) I have (unintelligible).

Man: Africa, you know (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: I know.

Man: (Unintelligible) extra (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: Continental (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible) graphs.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: Or (unintelligible) workflow. (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: You better.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible) the lion...

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: ...somebody (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Invite (unintelligible) where would they go? (Unintelligible).

Man: Yes. That's (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible)

Man: Then pass to (Malcom) back here.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: You have any (unintelligible)?

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Yes. Yes.

Man: (Unintelligible) whatever (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible) message (unintelligible) destroyed it (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Over and over (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: No. (Unintelligible).

Man: Oh (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: I'm more than (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: As in (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Did you already do it?

Man: No.

Woman: Oh.

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Okay. Thank you.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Did you save that last bit? That...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Let me do it. I'll (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: You guys get to go out (unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible). No idea. (Unintelligible).

Man: Hey, (Rocky)?

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible) not really (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Very close to our office.

Man: Oh okay.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible). Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible). Okay.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Thank you (unintelligible).

Man: Thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible)

Man: Right. I will (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible) here?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: That will (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: That will be outside.

Man: (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: All the way (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible) in case you (unintelligible).

Man: Oh. I'll be there (unintelligible).

Man: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: He wants to know where (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Woman: And 19. I am good to go.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: Oh okay.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: Okay. So you'll be right.

Woman: I'm not good.

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Okay. (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Madison), how are you today?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Yes. All right. Good. Have a little break here and I just thought I'd check in. I got your message about the truck. So I should be out there in plenty of time to pick it up this evening.

(Unintelligible) staying on - thanks for staying on top of it for me.

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Right. Okay.

Man: Well I will come and get it. I just didn't know how (unintelligible). Yes.

I don't know if it was me or you either, but it was when we brought it there.  
So - anyway do you think - so (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: We're going to be trying to save \$20,000 and put in a cheaper unit, but (unintelligible) right. I'm (unintelligible) about that too. (Unintelligible) concerns. Okay?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Thank you for doing that. I appreciate that. Because when - I also shared with similar concerns, you know?

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: Yes?

Woman: Okay.

Man: I agree. And I want to talk to (Chris Dobb) about it too just to really see, you know, what - for his (unintelligible) as well. So...

Man: Okay.

Man: But - well good. Well I got a little break here and if you want to just put me in my voicemail and just see if anybody needs me. (Unintelligible) are you on the office line or are you on your cell line?

Okay. And I'll just call now. I'm going to check my voicemail, but I'll just call the office back (unintelligible).

Man: That's fine.

Man: If you want to ask anybody if they need me to give me a call. Your (unintelligible). Okay? (Unintelligible) anybody tomorrow morning.

How we doing? You get something to eat? Sandwiches fine.

Man: (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: Hello, (Matt Harrishour).

Man: Yes.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible) big (unintelligible). I got your messages. I will be happy to call four of them tomorrow and I think you're absolutely right. We've been working quickly into the program, so he can talk about, you know, what you guys really do, because I know that they have to go into 24/7 mode, because (unintelligible).

So they (unintelligible) realm of what they're possible for (unintelligible). And it's the least we can do and I think it (unintelligible) well on our advance and (unintelligible) the people that have lost everything down there. (Unintelligible).

I don't know. No. But -- anyway -- yes. I would give...

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: ...them a call (unintelligible) of something and make it work and I appreciate you weighing in on it. You got any - you know, I've always (unintelligible) that we really appreciate your level of commitment and involvement (unintelligible) you know. I'm sorry it took me a day to get back to you on it.

I'm in committee meetings (unintelligible) so...

Yes, sir?

Man: Yes.

Man: (Unintelligible) on Twitter (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: I can believe that. Hoping (unintelligible) come to that (unintelligible).

Right.

Woman: So I was (unintelligible).

Man: Right.

Man: (Unintelligible). Yes. (Unintelligible). Yes. Yes. I have to do (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Okay. (Unintelligible) we know (unintelligible) you better be good.

Man: (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible) feel (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible) operation (unintelligible).

Man: We are all lights of green. We are go. So I appreciate everything and (unintelligible) we'll probably just (unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: ...you've got one last shot (unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: ...(unintelligible) we're good to go. So...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: ...I think it's great.

I'll see you next week.

Man: Good.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: That's crazy.

Man: (Unintelligible) well I (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible) you look.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Oh absolutely. Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible) up there (unintelligible). If you'd like to shoot (unintelligible).

Man: Great.

Man: (Unintelligible) I will be (unintelligible) in a couple of years. (Unintelligible) the year before. And I witnessed the same thing. It was frightening. I could have (unintelligible). Like in Amsterdam.

(Unintelligible) for me as well.

Man: I talked to (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: You've got a video in the presentation?

Man: Yes.

Man: Which do you want first?

Man: Video eight.

Man: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible) pictures.

Man: I don't know. (Unintelligible).

Man: Might not (unintelligible). So I'm wondering if I could (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible) I'll ask you.

Man: Okay. (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible) time I go in there (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible). Oh yes.

Man: Are you sure?

Man: For eight years.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: You tore the bottom of the pants?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: I (unintelligible) away (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: Yes.

Man: Yes.

Man: I wouldn't (unintelligible).

Man: It's your boss?

Man: Yes.

Man: Okay. Dude.

Man: (Unintelligible) want to kill (unintelligible).

Man: Yes. I (unintelligible). I (unintelligible) somebody said (unintelligible).

Man: Okay. Are we...

Man: Wait. I'm going to (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: I'm waiting.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible) three or four (unintelligible).

Man: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible) every day.

Man: Yes. Yes. I seen that (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible) talk about (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Yes.

Man: (Unintelligible) put a couple of things (unintelligible).

Man: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible). Yes. (Unintelligible). Like I (unintelligible).

Man: Yes.

Man: (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible)...

Man: (Unintelligible) for you.

Man: ...(unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible) familiar (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Think very hard (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Wait.

Man: Okay.

Woman: I (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: No. (Unintelligible).

Man: Yes. (Unintelligible) sideways (unintelligible).

Woman: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Yes. Yes.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Yes. Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Minimum (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible) email (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Didn't you (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Yes.

Man: Yes. (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Woman: A lot.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: I know.

Man: (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: Okay. Let's see if we can get people headed toward their seats and see if we can get (Eric)...

Man: (Unintelligible)...

Man: ...back in here.

Man: ...(unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: Yes. How many? Do you want one or you want two?

Man: What's that?

Man: Mystery (unintelligible).

Man: I am.

((Crosstalk))

Man: What are you doing?

Man: (Unintelligible). Back (unintelligible).

Man: I don't really - I don't know.

Man: So then a turkey and (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: You going in?

Man: Yes. Oh I love that tree.

Man: All right.

Man: I love that tree.

Man: Counselor (Hudson), if you would try to get towards your seat.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Who?

Man: The state department has important business over there, so...

Woman: The state department. That's important business.

Man: Oh yes.

Man: Hey (unintelligible)...

Man: Yes.

Man: ...(unintelligible)?

Man: Yes.

Man: Thank you. (Unintelligible).

Woman: Yes. (Unintelligible).

Man: As soon as the DFO returns we will get this...

Woman: Right.

Man: ...show on the road.

Woman: Here he is.

Man: Waiting on the DFO. The late (Ivan Carter).

Man: Late (unintelligible).

Man: He was a nice guy.

Man: Okay. DFO, with your permission we will get started.

Man: Mr. Chairman, it's your meeting, so...

Man: Okay.

Man: ...it's your pleasure.

Man: Thank you. And thanks for the perseverance of the ones in the audience. It's been a lot of presentations. They've all been outstanding. We have a couple more to go. I am confident they're going to be equally outstanding.

Our first one is going to be Craig Spencer. Craig is the Chief Warden of the Balule Nature Reserve and Greater Kruger National Park in South Africa.

And was supposed to have a lady named (Goodness Malonga) here as well. And she unfortunately had some transportation issues and is unable to make it.

But Craig created a group -- an anti-poaching group -- called the Black Mambas. (Goodness) was the one selected to actually make the presentation. Since she can't make it and Craig started the group he's going to make the presentation about the Black Mambas who -- from what we understand -- have had a tremendous deterrent effect on poaching of rhinos and elephants.

Craig, come tell us about it.

Craig Spencer: Thank you very much, Mr. (Timin).

(Unintelligible). Was a video. It will probably speak volumes. And I'd like to dedicate this little opportunity to our late minister passed away a few days ago. (Unintelligible)...

Man: Great.

Craig Spencer: ...Environmental Affairs.

Man: Okay.

Craig Spencer: The short illness that (Jupedi) contracted in China, which was immediately early in the month she has been very (unintelligible) to a lot of our conservation efforts in South Africa.

So a lot of you have probably heard about it, a lot of policy decisions and what have you made, very difficult, very controversial portrayal that she held. She will be lost to us.

Okay. So I'm going to place the play and let this do the talking for me.

((VIDEO))

Man: In September South Africans welcome the world as we host the 17th (Fightees) Conferences of Parties, the world's biggest wildlife trade conference.

As one of the first countries to join (Fightees) South Africa has always taken an active role in wildlife protection with the Department of Environmental Affairs here heading this work in partnership with agencies and stakeholders across the country.

South Africa is one of the most mega-diverse countries in the world. And we are committed to empowering communities through conservation and sustainable use of our natural resources.

This year -- as South Africa welcomes the world on the global environmental stage -- we take this opportunity to share the stories of South African communities and the many ways conversation is helping to improve livelihoods across our land.

Woman: Where we are right now is the Balule Nature Reserve. It's serving under Kruger, the Greater Kruger National Park.

Man: The environmental monitors program combines the need for the protection of our bio-diversity in general and the combatting of rhino poaching in particular.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: One project of the environmental monitors program is the Black Mambas.

Woman: The Black Mambas got it, because in this area there was a lot of poaching and also bush made. So when I talk about bush made is where by people will come with snares and then put the snares between the trees. That can cause any kind of (unintelligible).

Man: 2012 we lost a lot of rhinos, 19 rhinos fell within (unintelligible) sub-station. Everyone getting to all of the autopsies in time and we realize that we needed a different approach, something new.

And early detection, eyes and ears, visual policing, all of those basics, getting back to basics, a lot of lacking in the park. So hence the Black Mambas.

Woman: (Unintelligible) Mambas gives the (unintelligible) side (unintelligible) perform. Local runs (unintelligible) poacher (unintelligible).

(Unintelligible) is all women. It's because we are mother. We know how to (unintelligible).

When we are doing things we're doing it with care, love and patients. So that's...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: ...why it makes this program to be successful.

Our group has extended into the (Defo) people, the (Defo) ladies, Mambas.

Man: They've divided into five different units that are placed all over the western boundary of the - of this part of park. That every morning they get up and they walk a beach. So they walk their section of the boundary where poachers would have to come through there if they wanted to access the rhinos in the park. So they'll immediately detect if somebody's coming at first light or sometimes during the night.

Woman: ((Foreign Language Spoken 00:43:55))

Woman: The friends that we are patrolling here in all (unintelligible) west is (unintelligible). We have to patrol each and every day.

Woman: ((Foreign Language Spoken 00:44:13)) (Unintelligible) we are now (unintelligible) conservating (unintelligible) going in sight.

Woman: When are working they - and then we find their tricks. We are collecting information.

So the information that we can take back to the office to those guys who armed response and then that can lead arresting those poachers.

Woman: ((Foreign Language Spoken 00:44:48-00:45:48))

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: What is this? We have a permit for this.

Man: No. I don't need a permit. I don't know.

Woman: Where'd you get this?

Man: I don't know. I don't know where that comes from.

Woman: If we find someone with something with guard, the right to arrest a person.

Woman: You are under arrest. You have the right to remain silent. (Unintelligible)...

Woman: And we've got the right to seize those (unintelligible). So then we'll arrest that person. Then we'll call for backup to help us.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Okay. Help is on your way. I'm going to call. (Unintelligible) to come and assist you.

Woman: Since this program is (unintelligible) the bush made (unintelligible) 88% and then rhino poaching 76%.

Man: The right of (unintelligible) is still up. But because our protection is so good the poachers have not been successful. So we've made it an undesirable, unprofitable and dangerous place to poach.

Man: Okay ladies, well done. (Unintelligible).

Man: The environmental monitoring program is a program designed by national government under the extend of public works program. It's administered to the South African national parks in this area. And we fall into this Kruger to canyons biosphere reserve sub-region of the Greater Kruger National Park.

And they've presented this opportunity for job creation and skill development within the local community, in the tribal communities. If it wasn't for that little window for us -- that little opportunity -- we would never have been able to stop the Black Mambas financially and dinner-time-wise and what have you. They gave us the resources to kick it off.

Man: The Mambas are recruited from all communities on the western boundary of the Greater Kruger National Park. This includes the (Maseca) community where there is a high unemployment rate.

The Black Mambas offers job opportunities as well as educating communities on the importance of conservation and anti-poaching efforts.

Man: Yes. I guess I know (unintelligible) because (unintelligible) although (unintelligible) from the 10 (unintelligible) poaching (unintelligible).

Woman: Yes. I can see (unintelligible) ((Foreign Language Spoken 00:48:26)) like now I may bread win. ((Foreign Language Spoken 00:48:38)) everything. ((Foreign Language Spoken 00:48:52)).

Woman: I think we should conserve nature, because nature conserves us.

((END VIDEO))

Craig Spencer: Okay. That's it. Thanks.

The interesting thing is, ladies and gentlemen, is four of the faces that you saw on that video are no longer with us.

(Unintelligible) in Africa as well as life (unintelligible) cycles are very (unintelligible) and the people come and people go, so it's actually quite emotional to sit and watch that video even what it is. Karaoke.

Even my little three-legged dog was taken by a crocodile quite recently as well, so yes. It's hard.

Anyway I'll take off. It's going to be a tough act to follow, you know, having hear the other (unintelligible) regions speak and it's a pretty tough act to follow. So I'll just whiz through and hope that I won't embarrass myself.

I am no longer the head warden of that region, of the Association of Private Reserve in Balule. I stepped down quite recently to allow myself the freedom to pursue the Black Mambas model, because it's been such an affective model I would like to expand it a little further.

These are the role players transferring to Africa, of course the Black Mambas, the Balule Reserve, the Department of Environmental Affairs and South African National Parks. And then -- of course -- we have the Bush babies Environmental Education program, which is part of the Black Mambas. (Unintelligible) go into the schools in those local communities.

If I push this button what happens with that? Very smart. Okay.

So that's the Greater Kruger landscape that falls within the South African national boundary. That's little Balule. Can you see that funny little - oh my

sweet (Mary Jane). What have I done now? (Unintelligible) it doesn't matter. We'll just push the button here. No. We won't. Okay.

This is what we're trying to avoid at the end of the day. The Gary Larson cartoons are some of my favorites. This is not conversation. This is preservation.

Free range animals is a luxury for us. It creates a certain culture around it as well. It's a culture that I enjoy sitting on a (unintelligible) units scream and shouted (unintelligible). It's a culture that the hunters enjoy. It's a culture that the photographic safaris enjoy. Let's not get to this level yet. It's not helping anybody.

So what is our mission? I suppose the real reason why this Black Mambas program is significant to this panel is perhaps because it's a success story and it's something that we can celebrate and it's just a way to demonstrate how the wildlife economy can benefit people by giving ownership and what have you. So I'm hoping that that will come out in my talk.

But our mission. I'm not going to try to disguise anything. We have a poaching problem. We have a serious poaching problem.

There were about three incursions a week into that area of armed guards and the Kruger National Park is under siege from (Mosenbeak) and from our inside.

So we are trying to create a really undesirable and risky landscape for poachers to poach. That's the idea. It must be sort of not worth the while. Yes. Uneconomical for them to poach there and very risky the end of the day.

Ad we want to create patriotism. What I call environmental patriotism amongst the communities on our borders. Just the same way that if you go to France and, you know, every French person is a art connoisseur. ((Foreign Language Spoken 00:53:05)), which is the custodian of all the art traders in Europe and you can pay a lot of money to go and see the ugliest woman I've ever seen in my life, she's the Mona Lisa hanging on the wall. And yet people will actually pay money to go and see her and there's a lot of taxpayers money flowing into that to restore her and schlep her around all over the place and put her on display, et cetera. I hated the self portrait of Leonardo DiVinci. I want to say Leonardo DeCaprio. (Unintelligible) Leonardo DeCaprio. (Unintelligible) women.

But the reality is that those are national treasures and the people of France are comfortable with the fact that rates in Texas are paid to maintain that. And people come from all over the world to enjoy it.

You could take the Eiffel Tower, which is another hideous piece of scrap metal sticking out of the ground with the little red lights on the top. When you're flying to Paris you're going to dodge it with your airplane and, you know, and it's all in your face, every window you open at every hotel and what have you and beat the (unintelligible) obviously.

You know, you could melt that tower down at the scrap metal (deda) and give every poor person in France 100 Euros. But you can only do it once. That's the reality. No. You must scrape that thing down every year and paint it a (unintelligible) rust paint and so on and so on. But melt it down, give everybody - feed everybody for a month. The reality is -- of course -- that all their side-line industries and the spinoffs are the key rings and the post cards and whatever, they'll disappear as well.

Okay. So I'm going to whiz through this. These are my little Black Mambas. It started with six young women as a demonstration project on a 10,000 (unintelligible) reserve. We were having a particular problem with snaring. Bush meat industry is exactly that. It's an industry. And poachers don't just kill animals with guns. At least they - that's a little bit more selective. The snare with catch anything and kill anything.

Okay. So that's a little quote from one of them when they won the - what is that thing, that award that they won? The Champions of the Earth award from (Unic). Okay.

This is what it looks like now. They go through the proper para-military training. People say women can't do it. Yes they can. Do we want to create little G.I. Janes? No. When we do a parade it's more of a fashion parade than anything else. I want to see fancy hair, lip stick, earrings, et cetera. I'm going to celebrate the fact that they're women. And the G.I. Jane is for the movies.

All right. So we're trying to build this environmental patriotism at the end of the day. I'll get to the point eventually I promise you.

Okay. So early detection and crime prevention is one thing. The monitoring, surveillance and compliance I say every single one of my -- and they said stop the (unintelligible) -- every single one of my ladies is MSC, Monitoring, Surveillance and Compliance. They should put that at the bottom of the next (Depi)'s PhD.

Okay. Community buy in. To have a window -- an open window -- into those communities. So I can walk and sit down with the chief and have a chat with him any time. Because he's proud of the Black Mambas.

Okay. And then -- of course -- you have this huge problem with social decay and the false economy that is created through illegal harvesting of wildlife. The - if I can - I'm not sure if you guys are (unintelligible) with those sort of terms, but the model decay that happens in the community is not just a guy with a gun that goes into the reserve to shoot.

Okay? The traditional (healo) is nine volt. The kids are not going to school, because it's - they get paid off to carry a backpack with the contraband and is (unintelligible) drop it off at a certain place.

The little old lady who's got a car is being paid off to have her car used to drop people off at the side of the road and so on. It (unintelligible) ripples through the community and this is a problem. It's not just a poacher problem. It's a social decay that happens inside the community. I want people to understand that.

So it's a false economy. And we all know that the rhinos can't last forever. And when they go I think it's quite obvious that there will be a next species and the next species and the next species. The skill fit that you have in that community is eventually going to be, "Get what you want with a gun and dodge the law." You know, so what are you going to do next when the rhinos are gone, or if we actually ever get a handle on the poaching thing. And that's the only skill set left in that community.

So fascinating. If they could do a reality T.V. program on this Black Mambas thing I think it would work really well. They arrive for the interview dressed in their very best. (Unintelligible). Never spoken on a walkie talkie before. Never worn a combat boots. Never said alpha, bravo, Charlie or anything like that, you know.

With - in - it takes a while, because even the act of pushing the button on the walkie talkie and not releasing it at the wrong time and so and so.

Six weeks later this is what you get. Okay? And it takes a long time. The training is vigorous and it's hard. I have never had a single, single woman drop off the training. And I have about 36% dropout rates amongst the men. So it's (unintelligible) the hell with you. I'm not going to sit and take your (unintelligible) shit.", you know, sort of thing and they walk away.

The women have (unintelligible) I had one in broken ankle on training. She now runs the operations room. But otherwise every single one of them has made it.

All right. The (contravention) (unintelligible) that's one of the homemade weapons that the Mambas took off from the vehicle. You know you're putting your patrons under pressure when they have to start making guns out of drill bits -- what is that -- the drill handle and the silence is made out of a Maglite torch, it's stuffed with steel wool. So (unintelligible) three, seven, five bullets out of it. It's a very dodgy weapon. You have to line the drum up, the barrel and the drum and squeeze the trigger. It's a little bit off-centered. You're probably going to blow your hand off.

That gun killed six rhinos before we confiscated it. Difficult to get the (unintelligible) of a weapon like that. You can't exceed to. There's no rifling or anything. It is a homemade contraption.

So visual policing is an important thing. But what I want you guys to understand as well is that the Black Mambas can't do this alone.

So we have a three-tiered model on the landscape. Okay? The intelligence feeds into the top. I sit right at the top with the wildlife crime analyst in a bunker with completed screens and things. We analyze the (unintelligible) that comes in at the lowest level of the pyramid, which is where the Black Mambas are. On the X axis they cover the most (unintelligible) every single day, five units, up 20 kilometers a day. It's a lot of hectares. They capture every single piece of information that they can find whether it's a sweet paper or an old tin lying in the bush or what have you.

And from that we can analyze where the poachers are operating, when. So it's spatial and it's temporal and we have a small team of armed guards that back them up. They don't get seats. They hang around out there in the bush. The Mambas are the public interface. The tourists see them at the road blocks. They talking to people, gathering information.

I'm whizzing through this -- okay -- because I know you guys probably have heard a 1000 things like this before.

There's a community benefits. They go into the school.

Now when we talk about investing in schools, because that seems to be so cliché. We grow vegetable gardens and we go into schools and we dress as rhinos and dance on the stage with a puppet show or something.

But how do you extra-quantify your effectiveness with environmental education? How can you actually say that there's been a behavior change in that community through your investment? You keep throwing money after time and time again.

So our approach is to actually create a conducive teaching environment. It's very unfair to expect the teacher to go and teach at the school at 56 degree Celsius under that tin roof. She hasn't got a proper desk to sit on. She hasn't got teacher's aides, like a proper white board or a black board or I'm not sure that sounds so politically incorrect now, a writing board with pins and nice things, you know.

And it's the same with the pupil. How can you expect that pupil to schlep all the way to school over the thorns and the rivers and what have you to get there and (unintelligible). So you haven't got food in your stomach. You haven't got a desk to sit on. There's no stimulating materials on the walls or colorful pictures and what have you.

We're talking about five or six year old children here. You can't capture their imagination with face brick. It's not going to work. You know, so we want to create a conducive learning environment and a conducive teaching environment. That's how we start off.

And it has to be a consistent invasement. You can't just fling money at it and walk away, because -- you know what -- there's maintenance issues there.

And then the Black Mambas has all their own initiative. You can see in the bottom left-hand corner that's one of the classrooms that they (unintelligible) in the school holidays. I argued with him. I said, "No. The kids must (unintelligible) scrub their own desk (unintelligible) and build their own things and (unintelligible) ownership of it." They said, "No. (Unintelligible) matters." You know, "They don't tell us what to do. We will make sure. It's going to be a nice surprise for our children when they come back to school."

And they made nice little prints of animals going around the walls and everything was labeled and big trees painted all over the (unintelligible) and that's the costume that they did in their spare time. The one at the bottom. They mobilized the community walking up and down (unintelligible) save this, don't kill that, save the whales. You know? We don't have whales.

I threw this slide in, because having listen to everybody else for the last few days I thought it was appropriate that I might - although I think I should maybe mention a few things.

Trophy hunting, commercial hunting, whatever you want to call it, the wildlife economy -- okay -- has got so many possibilities. So many options. So many - if you can (unintelligible) one thing that we can rely on sometimes.

And we just have to be careful that we are not feeding the false economy of poaching. Because the same kind of corruption can happen. Where there's money flowing, money goes to all sorts of different places. So there needs to accountability for revenue flow if you know what I mean.

I'm a little bit against having done this for 24 years. Now on the first 11 years of my life was in a para-military environment in the anti-poaching arena. I am now against militarizing local communities. Because I've seen the consequences of it. Hence the fact that my Black Mambas do not carry weapons.

We are not here to create orphans and widows. It's contrary to what we're trying to achieve for the resilience of our national parks, because we are going to sit with the field range of coal and has a skill set of para-military rebels. You know, we're going to have a bunch of poachers that have to enter the arms race to keep up with us and we're going to sit on both ends of the scale.

We think we have the model high ground, you're replacing the life of an animal above the life of a human being. And psychologically it doesn't work. In the long term it doesn't work.

So let us not militarize our local communities, because destabilization in those communities.

Consistent revenue flow is critical. Black Mambas, terrible example, because we live from hand to mouth. We hold bingo evenings for God's sakes. I don't even know how to play bingo, but I have to sit there and shout out, "Number 11, lucky legs.", you know, and somebody shouts, "Yay. It's me." And then we make 5000 (unintelligible) 2000 (unintelligible) range (unintelligible) facility.

It's - you know, and that puts fuel in the car for now at the shop. So African government gives us 33% of our funding. The rest we have to top up. So there needs to be constant revenue set for any conservation initiative.

That is all good and well to say I've got 56,000 hectares of protected area, but who is killing the alien invasive cacti that come in there with herbicide. You know, who is - and everything is anti-poaching is how we save the land. It's not. There's bio-diversity issues there that we need to manage as well. It's (unintelligible) need rehabilitation. These mines on the periphery. The monitoring is research that needs to go into everything.

Somebody has to fund that and we need to be able to plan into the future. So one of the problems in conservation -- particularly in the ethic and context -- is you cannot plan into the future, because you don't know what you're going to have on your line, on your budget next year. So you can put up a sign board

today and tomorrow it will fall down. You don't even have varnish to paint it. So there's no progress.

I'm saying this now, because I think you have a bit of commercial hunting industry might be able to put some clever thinking caps on here.

It's patriotism towards wildlife areas is what I'm trying to achieve. Maximize the benefits as well. It's not just meat. Car seat covers made out of leather. I climbed into a BMW the other day and it had a slick leather hide and I'm convinced it's a buffalo hide. Could it be - you know, why am I giving out 25 buffalo permits to trophies and the head gets knocked on a plank and hung on a wall and the rest of it sits in the bush and rots. And that skin is probably worth 50,000 rand.

If that animal is going to die let's make maximum use of every product that it has. And that's like industry that you can create on our borders as well.

Anyway (unintelligible) I'm brainstorming as I go along. I did this at about 1:00 in the morning. There's no rum in this town.

Maximize benefits. We need to share the responsibilities. This is something that came out of the talk. We cannot compete or we cannot ask of the non-consumptive or the photographic safari industry to compete with the hunting safari industry. And we shouldn't be asking each other to compete either. You know, we need both on the landscape. We have to accept that both have an impact, some greater than others. (Unintelligible) problem (unintelligible) in the water of the ground and replacing it with sewage.

No. I'm actually doing some research on that at the moment. I will solve a huge problem with all the road nitwits that are cutting in the artificial water

holes that are required to provide for the base photographs and so on and so on. It needs to be managed.

There's been so much emphasis and so much focus placed on the management of taking one trophy animal off the landscape when they've got - or coming in and take the animal and disappear without leaving a trace. And it - I have lodge clients that linger. I have 14 commercial lodges in my jurisdiction people. I have lost almost 10% of the grazing capacity, the carrying - actually carrying capacity of that protected area to infrastructure, via air strips, roads, power lines, whatever it might be.

So - and that's for a non-consumptive industry. Nobody can tell me that that is sustainable unless we start managing that as well. But -- at the same time -- I need the revenue flow. (Unintelligible) tourists coming in three out of five access points into the protected and every single one of them coming in there. And we generate probably sixty or more percent of our income from the tourists. Not from the lodges, the tourists pays.

Anyway, share your responsibility, blah, blah, blah. (Unintelligible) transparency. It's critical. And we - I just come back from a parliamentary hearing in (Deccan) line hunting in South Africa and that one most controversial line that was shot, you think (thistle) was bad. We had one called (Sky). A pie in the sky. Sky is the limit. I mean all the jokes that came out after that was insane, you know.

And we - I don't know, but can we afford to lose one lion off the landscape? Absolutely. You know, is there going to be a potential cascade in the lion population? Probably. You know, there'll probably be another line and everyone thinks they go and kills the cubs and so we understand that. We bolt

that into the model. We're not buffoons. You know, and the rest of the world needs to see that.

If you - if the rest of the world had an opportunity to listen to the presentations that were given by the other set of regions here today they would be gob-smacked.

I obtained a lot of research forums, because I present papers and things there as well. And these guys need to get there and talk at the South African Wildlife Managers Association and those kind of places, because that was good stuff. Okay. And it's a pity that the rest of the world doesn't hear that.

We are not buffoons. And I'm actually tired of being labeled as a moron everywhere I go. You know, I am a professional in the work that I do. If we put out a permit for a lion to be shot it is because we have done our homework and we are aware of the risks.

So - and that is hardly (unintelligible) thrust. All we hunters ourselves know. Do we like hunting? I speak now for my organization. No. But we need it. If I had an option -- I'll tell you right now straight up with my cards on the table -- I wouldn't do it. But I don't have an option.

I can't pay for my helicopter fuel. I don't want an NGO some-wit to bail me out, because in the tail we'll wag the dog. I've been down that road already. If I have (unintelligible) horn or any of these other fantastic organizations (Henblidis Bach) is my Zimbabwean (unintelligible). (Henblidis Bach) (unintelligible) force, but also -- whatever his name is -- I turned him away. I won't have the tail wag my dog. I don't have a dog, because eaten by a crocodile.

But we can't run those risks. And we can't have all our eggs in one basket. Because if you put something on a social media platform and somewhere that guy doesn't like you anymore there goes your funding and your helicopter status and the poachers take over the landscape again.

We reclaimed that landscape. That landscape has increased. That little patch of green that I showed you on the previous map, that landscape has increased on 32,000 hectares to 56,000 hectares in three years. Why? Because the truth (unintelligible) and my (Sakie) tribe have offered their land into the park. They said, "If you give us Black Mambas, if you will train our Black Mambas...", this is exactly what the chief (unintelligible) speak on that video. His exact words to me were, "I've got this land. But I don't want it, because you came to me with this car and you said here you can have your car back after apartheid." And I said, "But look at this. It's got a million kilometers on the clock. The tires are flat and the seats have been ripped up." You know, "So fix the car first, you know, and then give me back my car and make sure that everything functions perfectly." (Unintelligible) "Fine. We'll do a rehabilitation and I'll move the (unintelligible) around and waterholes and what have you.

And then he said, "(Unintelligible) I don't have a driver's license to drive this car. So you're going to come back in a year's time and you're going to say, "Oh I gave you a beautiful car and you destroyed it." "Yes." So I said, "What do you suggest?" He said, "Take 10 of my women and train them and make them part of your Black Mambas team and let them run it." Then the (Maca Shawnee) tribe and the (Meshishi Mally) tribe (unintelligible) straight off to that.

So we had another -- almost 20,000 hectares -- of free range landscape or the habitat that we never had (unintelligible). I've never had that before. That's sweet in (unintelligible) for elephants and buffalo.

Okay. Honesty, honesty, honesty. Honesty verification process. Very important. I'm just rambling. Yay. Here's my little role models. That's what you need in the community. You need role models in the community. Not somebody who makes a quick buck from shooting something and he gets a BMW at the age of 18 and a flat screen T.V. in his little (unintelligible) and that's what all the kids want to inspire to be now.

"We don't go to school anymore. We sneak around in the middle of the night and we set snares and blah, blah, blah, because I can have all of those things without going to school." Those are the role models that we're trying to create into the community.

But I can't create a role model if these ladies are always on the braid line and are working nine to five and they go home with nothing more than a gate guard or something. Then that's not a role model anymore. They need to be paid appropriately. The wildlife economy needs to pay it. Support it.

I'm pushing a button, I can't remember which one. Here we go.

They have pride, human dignity is something that's come out quite strongly if you listen to the talks. You don't give other just to appease your conscious and chip off a block for your next hunting (unintelligible) we're then just giving it away and say, "(Unintelligible). We're going to schlep some paint on the wall as a white-washing exercise or a window dressing exercise." We have to maintain human dignity.

We people, we want to work for our living. We want to feel like we've earned it. Okay. That was winning that award at the United Nations. It'd be very nice if the - if the keep (unintelligible) and those guy actually recognize the Mambas. That was in 2015. I don't even know what was going on. I just sent them on an airplane and they landed in New York City and they got this thing.

And somebody showed me on a cell phone sitting around a campfire. They said, "Aren't these your ladies." I said, "Absolutely. What are they doing there? I sent them to New York to go get an award and they want T.V. and they're going to (unintelligible)." So this is the words from the Black Mambas themselves. They (unintelligible) one of my favorites. She's about this big, a little key ring size thing. And she said, "We don't want to live in a village of orphans and widows." She said, "You guys keep shooting our husbands and our brothers and what have you, putting them behind bars or they're going to work on mines in Mozambique or whatever it might be.", you know, and there's just the women left in the community.

And now you take the women out of the community and give them a job for 21 days (unintelligible) they stuck in the bush. So who's looking after the kids? So we have to be aware that the role of the women in the community is critical. So we can't take them out and forget that. It's got to be 50/50. So that's how the Mambas work. Half are on duty. The other half are on duty, but at home on duty if you know what I mean doing motherly things.

You know, we all made these bracelets for them. It's supposed to be, "Be in sense for Black Mambas." But they changed it. They say (unintelligible).

So they also say at the same time we run a rhino or we do the security of the rhino orphanages as well. And they also say that we also don't want to live on

a landscape without the wild animals. At the same time they want to (unintelligible) cake and eat it kind of thing.

The - these other words of the Mambas themselves, “We are bread winners. We have respect. We have pride. We have got skills, dignity and a sense of identity which is quite important.”

You know, we offered them alternatives in some vacancies that pop-up on the landscape. Pay more, you tend to wash around in the bush and dodge wild animals all the time. And they actually tend to stay in the (unintelligible) units because that gives them their status in the community.

So just a little bit of the sort of technology behind it. It's not so easy. I want the world to understand that as well. You just don't dump a bunch of people on the landscape in a corky uniform and tell them to go and catch (pouches). There's a lot of tracking going on. There's a lot of research into this.

As I said (Tom Snich) set in my camp and we've thrashed a lot of this predictive modeling stuff out in those days and I hope you can be proud to see how we actually implement it now.

And other information was gathered from drones and what, what, what. I guess we know where the hotspots are. That's a basic internal density assessment of where the assets are. We see the (rhino) as an assets. In fact the (rhino) is a courier. Assets are a (unintelligible).

And the blue lines is where the black numbers have patrolled in that specific space of time. So you need to know where your assets are. You need to know where to deploy asset landscape. I can't have them deployed all over the show. You need to deploy them strategically.

Now this is a predictive model again (Tom). So this comes through to the cell phones that they carry every evening and every morning before they patrol to show them where they need to be. A (red rhino) is a (rhino) that's very close to being shot by a poacher to explain it basically.

We get a little report back. This is all automated so this comes through every evening, you know, (in every office) - Atlanta, New York, Washington. I think I've toured all the states this morning going through this building actually. I walked – and I have a (buffalo) thorn in (my foot), the buffalo thorn stuck in my foot.

And I think I've felt that thorn up to my knee now walking from that side of the river to here. I'm glad I made it. Anyway, this is just, there's a lot of statistical analysis going around on how effective – are the patrols deployed in the right area?

We have to keep this up every single day so we move them around quite a lot. They move themselves. They drive the land rovers and what have you. It's special like I said before so I can see immediately that the mobile patrols have been operating at sunrise and sunset.

This is exactly what I wanted to see. Now there isn't any point to them moving around the middle of the day at 2:00 at noon because the poachers aren't active. When they're active, that's when they're going to detect.

And then this is just going on, there's gunshot detection capabilities so up at the top of the little black dots with the red circles and the yellow circles, that's where gunshots were detected by the mobile patrols and verified by caucuses sadly.

And then the blue dots are the way the members are actually sitting so it's just interesting to see, you know, if you're outside of that concentric ring and we've tasted this, it's a (C75) and a (45H), you need those calibers to kill a rhino, you know.

You know, just how far can you go? This would have to be placed on the landscape to effectively hear a gunshot. Acoustic detection, that's what we're faced with a nighttime and – what's the next one. Anyway, there's something missing with that slide, I think.

Yes, anyway, doesn't matter. There's are (. The significance of this is from the members' daily patrols. (camera traps). The significance of this is from the members' daily patrols and those maps that look a little bit like that. Okay, it showed that it was a new route that the poachers were using.

We would never have known that if we didn't have the boots on the ground covering the landscape. As a result I asked the members to move two (camera traps) and within 12 hours those (camera traps caught those guys which was insane.

So we need to keep on top of the game. (Unintelligible) (Tom) will remember this, the predictive model, predictive reaching observation theory and hunting conservation techniques so it colors mu landscape in the red squares or the danger squares in a one square kilometer grid (the other day).

That's how e deploy. That's the way the members operate now. All those little stars - I don't know if you can see the asterisks with the yellow circle around. Those are the caucuses at that time lying on the landscape. We had a big problem last - we seriously had a big problem.

These were hunters. The poachers came in and took out the rhinos. We never hunted a rhino lethally. We sold a few – large sales but the poachers pretty much took them out. It's an open system so they came back in again. I don't know, they stole some rhinos from (unintelligible) or something.

Okay so this is just the lifestyle of the members, you know, their picket stations - going out every day. Totally independent ancient old Land Rovers – frightening.

(Unintelligible), I mean you're heard this 100 times. There's another (soft) congratulatory meeting so I'm going to wiz through these slides. (We can be very proud of our achievements. There is a typical bush meat kitchen at the bottom

We've pulled out probably 16, all these bush meat kitchens in our first year of operations. It looks like the hanging gardens of Babylon from hell. It's just meat hanging in trees. You guys have seen these things before I'm sure, a typical poacher's camp.

It's just meat hanging low, that's all, cleverly hidden away under the bushes so the vultures and things don't give the location away. Every species hanging in those trees.

There were wild dogs that had been chopped up for traditional medicine. They were caught in those snares, a seriously endangered species and other things as well. That problem doesn't exist on my landscape anymore thanks to the (mother). That's them. This (mother). That (mother).

So this is one of my last slides girls. You can start relaxing now. I need to (unintelligible) anyway. How do we build resilience for a protected area and that's what we've all been trying to talk about here. How do we build resilience?

We can put (unintelligible) on things. That's counterproductive. We can't shoot the problems off our landscape because that's also counterproductive to what we're trying to achieve. We need to give a tangible return back from the landscape to the people that are the custodians of that landscape.

Tangible isn't something you can touch and feel. I like intrinsic values. I can hear the hyenas at night and I love to sip my rum and – my coffee around the campfire whilst I smoke my pipe, you know and that sort of thing.

But its – that's not something you can touch and feel. You can't quantify. If I want those local communities to buy in and offer me the opportunity to help them manage their land for wildlife. We need wildlife. I lost 36 elephants to damage causing animal permits through my boundaries last year during the draught which is why we approached the tribes and said, please, can't we just expand into your area and (unintelligible) members, you know, blah, blah, blah.

I put out 23 permits in my capacity as Head Warden for that financial year for trophy elephants. I lost 36 to damage causing animal permits. I want people to understand the perspective here.

They are free range lions. They leave the protected area. If you want to start a war with your local community tell them that their cattle means nothing - my line means everything. You're going to lose.

Your park, your protected area is not resilient then. And the sociopolitical environment that we're living in is particularly difficult for me because I am lily white and although I'm (unintelligible). It's embarrassing.

It is, you know.. I can't come in as a missionary with my wisk and ideals and it's really cool for me to sit in the water holes and wait for an animal to come in And take a picture of it and stick it up on my fridge or send it on Facebook, you know.

And then I want to be a conservationist so I like a picture of a baby dolphin on Facebook and put a picture of a sad face with the tears coming down typical with a stalk stuck up its nose). You know, it's a terrible thing. I hate seeing those things on social media. It upsets me. It does.

But I'll save the day because I'll put a - add a little boohoo sign with a little round guy with a tear. It's not saving the world. I swear on my mother's premature grave that it's not saving anything.

I can eat celery sticks and drink carrot juice until I die but I am not saving that wildlife doing that. I don't know why I'm telling you this because you know this already. Who am I preaching to? I feel like I'm sitting on one of the travelling salvation shows, you know.

So that's the reality. I need the landscape. I need the landscape for the wild animals. How do I achieve that in an African context? I go to those people and I offer then something in return, something they can touch and feel. Something that touches their basic feeling amongst the hierarchy of human needs – the hunger, the security, those things.

Let's address that because what we're talking about in the conservation arena – I run an NGO. I run it down and I run it badly. But I run an NGO. And we're talking about a philosophy. Conservation has become philosophical. It's actually this thing that we can sit and debate around a campfire.

We have the luxury of standing here and even having this discussion. Why? Because we don't have to apply a single moment of our time to worry about where we are going to get our next meal? How my kids are going to get to school? And how I'm just going to survive the night when the elephants come in and thrash my crops?

We don't have that luxury in the activity budget in our minds. My people, if I could be so presumptuous living on the periphery of (unintelligible) don't have that luxury. The entire operational window of sunrise to sunset, there's no (electricity) there.

Sunrise to sunset is occupied with trying to get food on the table for the kids, protein and nutrient requirements, shelter. The skinny calves and goats have to be taken out too and go and give water and food and all that sort of thing. And yet I have the (unintelligible) to go there and say hey guys, you got 8,500 (unintelligible). M elephants need it.

I stood on the only fence, we have a bridge with some elephants fiddling around at the bottom (unintelligible). And everybody else stood around and I heard the one guy say wow, this farmer must be very rich. Look at all of these elephants.

And it broke my heart. I knew how expensive it is to keep these bloody things alive and the landscaping but that's the perception. Anyway blah, blah,

preach, preach. Skills development services provided support for the local industries.

We need local industries. One of the anomalies that we've seen in our area is the consumptive users and it's not just the hunters. We have a lot of other consumptive users – water extraction from the rivers and so on.

There is benefit flowing to a community but it's a community that they choose because grandmothers, nanny or something came from there, what, what, what.

But that little chart sitting right, that's actually where the custodians of that land, where the custodians of that land are not getting that direct revenue flow. And so it's a bit of a problem. I don't know if the problem exists in other areas but it's something that we never considered.

We didn't realize that this was happening and so we actually scrutinized it. If there's going to be hunting, for example or a commercial lodge established in that area, the benefit needs to go to the community that is directly connected to that land.

And it wasn't happening believe it or not. Okay. What am I banging on about here now? Corruption, the corruption monster I'll call it. It's a big problem. Finished, I was lucky.

I wanted – so in closing, I thank you very much for the opportunity to come here and sort of harass you with my philosophies and so it. It really is an honor. I nearly didn't make it because I was dumped on the wrong side of the river this morning.

There's a lot of statistics floating around. When they talk about conservation A, it's philosophical but B, I can go – I'm not a hunter. I will tell you that straight. I think I might have mentioned that before. My organization supports hunting because it's a fantastic tool in our toolbox.

If I don't ever have to hunt myself I will be happy. I conduct hunts. I don't carry a weapon when I do. I'm (Gondi). But you cannot stand on the sideline and criticize and say oh, I shouldn't have shot a big tusk. You're not supposed to shoot this unless you're there.

You can't watch a Rugby game and (hold abuses at the wrist) of the players and say come pick up that egg shaped bladder filled with air and see if you can stick it between those two sticks.

So that's the reason why we conduct, (BNJ) will conduct hunts. We will make sure that the protocols are followed and whatever. We're third party requiring a payment. Half of the world thinks we're raving lunatic (bunny huggers). The other half of the world thinks we're a bunch of murderous bastards.

So I'm not schizophrenic now, I've no idea what I am. I've even got hate mail. It's from a Danish (unintelligible) claiming that I couldn't even keep a hamster alive if I tried. Meanwhile you've just taken eight of my elephant permits.

So anyway, so it's a controversial game. Now what I wanted to tell you is that the statistics that you see flying around, okay, are a lot like bikinis. What they show you is important but what they're hiding is essential so always dig a little deeper to get to the truth.

This is a very wise committee. I know that everything we say here has really been investigated and you guys have travelled more widely in Africa than I have probably but I'd like to leave you with just this one statement.

We can manage the photographic safari history in parallel with the trophy hunting industry. We can and they can occupy the same landscape. We've demonstrated that. It works. Again, we can't live without the one. In other words, we can't have one without the other. We need both.

So that's it. Thank you very much Mr. Chairman. Thank you everybody for the opportunity.

Man: Thanks Craig. Thanks for a very lively presentation. And looking at the numbers, there are a 76% reduction in poaching and over 1000 snares moved, 20 kilometer per day on foot.

You've got some ladies that are extremely dedicated and your system is obviously working and working with the communities, working with the schools and explaining wildlife conservation. I was quite impressed with your presentation.

Other statements? Questions?

Woman: I have a question. So lovely. Thanks for bringing us the information (unintelligible) because I think when they were mentioned in our previous meeting by Dr. (Snitch). We are interested in (Deep Peak).

So can you explain a little more or maybe just tell us some more about the fact that they're not armed because I am not there but it would seem that they're in

a bit of a precarious position with poaching on one side of them, whatever their command staff is on the other side and there they are in the middle.

Craig Spencer: It's a good question. Thank you. So it's thought of quite a lot. So the women are not an arming component for several reasons. The first reason is because they work on the periphery so early detection so eyes and ears and what have you.

The poachers are driving up and down lying in the bush looking whatever and watching for an opportunity. If we see those woman are carrying weapons then they have to consider defending themselves against the women so at the moment they just have to wait for them to drive past or walk past whatever it is and then they can slip in.

And the regime is designed in such a way that when they come back again they'll pick up those tracks they've found. So that's the first reason. Now I'll put my anthropology hat on now. If you analyze poacher behavior, the poachers (unintelligible) have formed to kill an animal. To kill a human being is a very, very different set of thought processes that you have to go through.

Now we don't want to offer somebody in that community a new business model and the poachers go back and say oh my goodness, these women are running around like mad women with machine guns now, you know. So if you're a security guard off duty I'll give you 10,000 bucks to come with me and bring a 9 millimeter.

Or you're a policeman, when you're off duty why don't you bring your R1 assault rifle fully loaded and come with us at night for 20,000 bucks and so on.

That would be offering a different business model. The poacher's entire behavior, the reason why they use silencers, put sponge under their shoes, sneak in and out in the dead of night and whatever is because they don't want to be detected.

We measure that with the traditional medicine that they carry as well. There's an ethnobotanist botanist Dr. Tony Cunningham and he analyses – you know Tony, yes. And it's fascinating the stuff that comes up.

The more pressure we put them under the different traditional medicine juju that they have to carry, you know. And that's just one way – juju in the medicine sense not in the religious sense.

Woman: (Voodoo)

Craig Spencer: Okay, good. It's voodoo? Anyway, I can't remember what I was saying now. So we measure the poacher behavior. So to weapons in the hands of the women I think would be kind of (dangerous).

Also I don't ever want to put them in a situation where they have to potentially use their weapon because having been in that situation for 11 years of my life and you're going to (jump) when you hear a door slam and you'll be jittery and twitchy and we don't have such things as counselling, you know, and crystals that you rub.

A little (unintelligible) hanging in the window or whatever, we don't have that in Africa. You shoot somebody, often you live with it for the rest of your life. You hope that the hyenas do the rest so that you don't get locked up. You know, those are the realities.

And I don't want those women to have to consider that psychologically. You know, they already live in a very violent environment. Their homes are violent.

Woman: I had a point in asking about that in the position that they're in and between the two powers that be is you have not had the situation where poachers, if I was going to be a more effective poacher and I see these women walking the perimeter and they're going to tell on me and I know they're not armed well, eventually aren't I going to remove that threat to my business model? You haven't thought of that?

Craig Spencer: You're right absolutely but the biggest risk to the women are actually wild animals. They've been chased around and thrashed and chased up trees and whatever from everything from black rhinos to buffalos.

The way that you have to set this up is you have to start at the recruitment level with the chief and the tribal council, what they call a CPA, the Community Property Association.

In other words, if the selection process engages them, they then say to the community, these are the women that I have chosen to protect this area. If you harm a hair on the head, you're on for (unintelligible).

So it's not my black members, it's the communities' black members.

Woman: And the same community from which the poachers come.

Craig Spencer: Well not necessarily. Sometimes they hob within that community.

Woman: Right. Okay.

Craig Spencer: Now interestingly enough there was a Mr. (Michael Strain) that is from your foreign office I think. Do you know (Michael Strain)? He is a very close friend of my and a colleague and he helped me design this selection process for the little ladies with experience he had got with deployments elsewhere in the world.

And if you go to the chief's (ladies), the chief's idea and his ladies. And of course there's lots of nepotism. I think it's the chief's niece and sort of nephews with wigs on and everything, you know, coming to try and get a free job. Of course, that doesn't happen with (the wind) but you know what I mean, anyway.

Man: Well thank you for a great - and we're sorry that (Goodness) was not able to make it because of the transportation issues in South Africa.

Craig Spencer: She would have done a better job than me I promise you. Thank you.

Man: Thank you. Next presentation. (Rocky McBride) is a guy originally from Alpine, Texas who's - am I interrupting something (Harry)?

(Harry): Just getting it ready.

(Bill): Okay. (Rocky) is from Alpine, Texas. Grew up with his father being a predator control guy for Texas and ranchers and everybody west. (Rocky) graduated from Texas Tech I think in 1982, if I remember correctly, and decided that he wanted to be a big cat specialist.

And (Rocky) has worked with the Florida Panther Program to get it, I guess back in the late '80s, early '90s, to get it rejuvenated and up to where they

now have about as many panthers as Florida can handle. And has been all over Central South America working on big cats.

We had the pleasure and opportunity to go to Paraguay and spend some time within the jaguar program back in June. And I know him to be a guy who's got a tremendous amount of knowledge on everything concerning jaguars, mountain lions, ocelots, jaguarundi and whatever other cats are in South America.

Oh, I might mention that his wife, (Monica) is with him today from Alpine and (Monica's) very active in the community out there as well.

(Rocky): Well (Bill), thank you. Thank you all council members for inviting me. I can assure you I'm not going to be as entertaining as Craig was but I hope I can be (informative), if we can find my ...

((Crosstalk))

(Rocky): You know, it's kind of a long story how I got to Paraguay. And I won't bore you. I know everybody's anxious to conclude this but, you know, (Bill) mentioned, my father was a – worked for the wildlife service. He was a troubleshooter for the state of Texas.

And when I was a little kid, I mean, my earliest memories were, you know, mountain lions and jaguars and wolves. And actually in 1964, the next photo, he was actually sent to Mexico as part of an agreement with the Cattlemen's Association of Mexico to teach them how catch wolves and, you know, how to kill their predators because back in those days it was an eradication program.

You know, it wasn't a control program or a conservation program. And that kind of lends to, you know, how the pendulum swings so far back that, you know, you go from total eradication to, you know, total conservation which, you know, somewhere in the middle is, you know, kind of a middle ground where things should be.

But long story short we, you know, we moved a lot when I was a kid. I lived in Mexico. I lived all around but it enabled me to, you know, have the background to continue to work, I later ended doing.

You know, back to the eradication program in Texas, you know, it was just, they were actually trying to kill all the coyotes. You know, they were trying to figure out a way to, you know, kill coyotes out. They killed the wolves out. They killed the jaguars out. They killed the grizzlies out of Texas.

And so but the mountain lion was a pretty resilient animal. It was labelled to reoccupy territory. The rules in Mexico that my father was sent down to teach them how to kill. Well later they contracted him to go down there to catch the last remaining wolves as part of the Captive Breeding Program that they're doing in Arizona.

Later on when I was growing up one of my first contracts was to go to the Guadalupe Mountains National Park and catch mountain lions that were, you know, problem animals that went out of the park killing sheep when they were ranchers. But I had to live capture them because it was a national park.

And we took them to South Texas and to the Welder Wildlife, W. Welder ranch and that's kind of how mountain lions got started in South Texas. They were originally there but they had been killed out.

A later contract was to catch live lions for the Florida Panther (unintelligible) restoration program in Florida. We removed, we took 40 West Texas mountain lions from West Texas to Florida. I guess this was probably in the late 80s, early 90s.

But anyway, the panthers in Florida were just about, you know, genetically inbred to the point there was no reproduction. So anyway these, you know, this is the cast that we took from West Texas which was the nearest population to those in Florida and also it was Texas being the only state that mountain lions are not game animals.

They're predators so there was no legal take. I actually took the mountain lions out. We did a quarantine on them to Midland, Texas and put them on American Airlines and shipped them to Florida.

Yes, we carried the lions in toolboxes and just whatever way we could to get them back home. And at one time I had like 25 lions, (panthers), you know, feeding them during a quarantine period before we took them to Florida.

We started the program or the capture work in Florida in 1982 but I actually went to Florida in 1977 as part of a – they didn't really know they had panthers there, you know, panthers in Florida.

Anyway I went as a senior in high school to the Big Cypress National Preserve to scout and see if there were lions there. When I saw the water and the trees, you know, the environment, I just said there's no way there could be panthers here because, you know, just to see them in the mountains or West Texas but the very first day I found panther tracks.

And then in 1982 they contracted my father to catch the first panthers and then subsequently the program's still going today. The dogs that we use, the same hounds from West Texas, I mean, you know, they go to the swamp and, you know, they don't necessarily know what they're looking for.

There are a lot of different smells but they find something familiar in, you know, the panther trails they find. The studies are so well funded and one of the ways they are funded is through the sale of license plates. You know, you buy a Florida license plate with a panther picture on it for ten extra dollars.

That money goes to a fund called the panther trust fund. It's I think \$16 million a year it averages so that's how the state funds their part. And the federal land of course is federally funded but then we use helicopters. I mean no amount of equipment is left out.

And, you know, compared to the study I have to do, in South America where we've got pretty meager funds. But over the years, you know, between me and my father and now my oldest son we've caught over 600 Florida panthers, ore recaptured or targeted captures.

So anyway it's been an ongoing long term project. It employs permanent biologists, veterinarians. It's quite a program. But I bring all this stuff up because, you know, this is the background that later started you know, the knowledge of working on these different studies when I finally get to South America.

I was contracted to do a jaguar study in Venezuela between 1993 and '95. That was the first time I'd actually gone to capture jaguars for a study. This was for the University of Florida. And I may be going too fast. I know you're

tired already but if you all do have any questions anywhere along here just please feel free to interrupt.

I did another jaguar capture in Brazil two years ago for the national park there. When I started the jaguar study, in fact (John Jackson) was one of the first to come down there. You know, in the initial phase we were just trying to figure out – I'd been to South America – I'd been living in South America since 1985.

But – and at that time I was actually hunting jaguars really. That was a reason for me to go down there and it was legal at the time. You couldn't necessarily export them out of the country but it was legal to hunt until 1993.

Well by that time I'd already bought a property there and so, you know, I had a vested interest. I wanted to continue hunting the jaguars. But I realize, you know, I can't break the laws here so I started doing a jaguar research project.

And, you know, I've been familiar with other jaguar research projects and O I have the background at least to get it started and I learned a lot. My idea was, you know, to fund the thing through – I didn't have any funding so I funded the thing through Sports Hunters.

And I went out and bought (collar). I would take him on the hut. We'd take a picture of the cat. You know, we did this, you know, throughout the country. I had the blessings of the (Fairwang) government. We had a permit from them and sometimes they would come along but most of the times they wouldn't. I started you know, in the area around the ranch that I had but I ended up going all over the country – the east side of the country in reserves.

And anyway it was quite a – it was still ongoing but it's been quite a unique experience. You know what's really changed a lot is the GPS technology, you know that comes with this.

You know, the originally studies that were done on jaguars and they haven't been really that many even to date but they were VHF telemetry. So anytime you do a study where you're just having to go out and locate the animal by hand, you know, there's big holes in your data because when you don't find the cat you don't know where it was.

So you know there was a GPS technology. It really started improving you know, how you could keep up with the cats. And the originally GPS technology was an (unintelligible) board so you'd have to go to the cat, turn it loose. A year later try to come back and find him with VHF and then capture it to get your radio collar off.

Now they have what they call real time GPS where you could just monitor the cats, you know, right then in real time. Recently where I'm headed to all this is we've been relocating problem jaguars. I mean I've studied the jaguars. I've written peer review publications.

But, you know, at the end, you know, we're not, we know they have big home ranges but the problem is, you know, what do you do with the jaguars that are killing cattle? So I've been involved the last two years, we've been going to ranches, catching problem jaguars, you know, the same time with sportsman.

And then when we identify them, we put a radio collar on the jaguar killing, you know, cattle right them. We monitor that that is the jaguar that's doing most of the predation. There is a standard, you know, how many cows, if it

kills or is trying to set a standard of, you know, what is considered a problem jaguar?

Four cows a month - eight cows a month. We're getting to where, you know, we're trying to establish, this is considered a problem jaguar. There are several things. You know when you lose a problem jaguar, landowners kill all the jaguars not necessarily, you know, to just get rid of the one problem jaguar.

And so they have given us permits to relocate the cats. In the long haul, then you relocate a jaguar, you're just relocating the problem so you have to have, you know, it's really difficult to have an area to, you know, relocate it to. We've had some success in areas where there's a high prey base and not many cattle.

But you take an old male jaguar that's learned to kill cattle or you'll get a bitch weighted or something, I mean it's just a problem so what I'm trying to get the government to recognize is A, you know, people are going to kill the jaguar if it continues to kill our livestock.

B, it's expensive and without, you know, the sportsman to go along or, you know, pay for basically all the problems associated with locating a pat, putting a radio collar on it, studying the one that's killing the cattle, you know, putting in in a box and taking it 300 miles someplace, so, you know, in the end the cat's going to get killed anyway.

So were looking at the possibilities of harvesting that cat but on a very limited basis, you know, and generate funds for it. There's a lot of obstacles in something like that and I'll go into the reasons. Well, you can imagine the reasons why.

You know, but since 1977 there've been no legal imported jaguar skins in the United States which A, makes is a trophy animal. You know, a very desired trophy animal but B, it makes it, you know, a grandfathered-in kind of a law that would be really difficult to get the permitting for – to give CITES' permits for.

One of the problems with, you know, South America, the governments are very, well – first of all they don't even have basic hunting CITES of two, three animals. Most countries don't. So secondly it would be hard to get the proper data to, you know, submit to CITES.

I mean (John) would know a lot about this but mean until you could have a management, you know, show that you're protecting a sustainable or increasing population, it's going to be hard to get the permitting for it.

This is actually the current range of where the jaguars are in Paraguay. They're pretty much restricted to the western end of the country now, the northern end. And except for a few small reserves in the eastern part of the country – there's a map, you know, obviously where Paraguay is in the center of the map.

You know, I listen to all these reports. Habitat loss is going to be, you know, your main problem in all these areas but, you know, you think about it, there's 7.5 billion people. They got to eat so habitat loss is not going to go away. That's something that's going to continue to, you know, increase.

Paraguay does have laws that you can only clear 75% of your land. You have to leave 25% as native state so there is something to work with but you have to be able to, you know, work with land that's left. You know, and we've been

trying to get the government over there the to allow land owners to put their 25% together to make bigger blocks and have different corridors but in the end, you know, it's a - habitat loss is going to be – that's a really tough issue.

One of the unique things about Paraguay is 96% of the land is in the private domain so that is unusual for South America. I mean there's no government land, state land, very few. The rest of the other 4% is a national park so Paraguay is a private land country.

It has 16 million head of cattle and 6 million people. And the land mass of Paraguay, you know, it looks small because it's around Bolivia, Brazil, but it's a very big country. It's bigger than the state of California so it is a sizeable country. It just looks small on the map.

And land ownership is very big private ranches in the western part of the state. You know, jaguars like lions, like leopards. They don't know boundaries. They don't know fences so, you know, they hear cattle crying across, you know, either from the reserves they're going to go across the fences so there's got to be a way to manage, you know, to try to separate the two.

But, you know, you can't so you have to manage it. You know, the predation conflict is constant. It's all over. I get calls, you know, I mean there's no way I can even answer all the calls that you get, you know, because land, I mean, you know, problems with jaguars killing cattle, it's just a frequent deal.

A wean cap is just the perfect size for a jaguar. I mean it's made of – the size is probably built to go kill. It is probably, one of the problems with the jaguars killing cattle is they're really easy to poison. The jaguar really comes back to kill something large so the buzzards find it, the cowboys find it.

You know, they have two or three days even to, you know, because it's a large animal, the cat keeps coming back to it so nowadays, you know, the most common way to kill them is either to poison them or just set up a (blind) ,you know, and sit there at night with a shotgun to shoot it.

We started a study a few years ago, in 2009, on one ranch where there was a lot of predation. And the landowner agreed to, you know, not kill the cats, you know, the coyote cats or any of the cats period. It was a very big ranch. It had 16,000 head of cattle.

But, you know, what we found of course a lot of what we knew, but the cows, most of the predation, 95% was either calves of six months to a year and a half old and I mean that's the size that the jaguars prefer.

There was a 20%, it actually started off at about 18% and it got up to – well, excuse me, 15%. It got up to 20% of the annual predation of the cows on this ranch were through jaguar glosses. And that equates to about, we figured to about \$180,000 a year on this one ranch.

And it's increasing because I mean, you know, first of all your jaguars become a bitch way of killing cattle so they raise their kittens, they start killing cattle. You know, when you're limited, a lot of that, a lot of the problem cats, it's, you know, it reduces it so it can really become a financial burden to the ranchers there.

Of the 61 jaguars we've collared, 18 of them we've known to have been killed. And when you put a GPS collar you could see actually the collar was cut and it's bolted down at the bottom but we do find, you know, we find them with the collar just cut off or they kill the jaguar

Nowadays they destroy them because they realize what they were. In the beginning they had no idea what the collars were. In fact on two different occasions the jaguar was on a ranch one day and it was in the capital the next day so we show up at the guy's house and ask him where his collar is or where our collar is but he was quite surprised.

There's hundreds of jaguars killed every year and, you know, I've always looked at it the same but just about any ranch you go to you'll see this. I mean it's just a jaguar skin, you know, tacked up on the side of the house. It's not a sustainable rate of decline because it's just, it's a little more excessive than what the jaguars can stand.

You know, as they go farther and farther north into the bigger jungle tracks, you know, clearing it and it's, you know, it's going to be hard for that to be sustained. There's also the problem with, you know, there we don't even call it poaching.

I mean the locals, they feel like they have the right. And most of it is internal poaching. I mean all the cows – a lot of these large ranchers they've got contractors, woodcutters, post-cutters, cowboys. In most cases they're allowed to hunt some of the native game just because the landowner, it cuts down some of this costs protein, you know, for their protein.

But anyway, you know, until the land owners themselves can become the game wardens to control this, that's another big problem which also drives the jaguar to, you know, killing cattle. You know, the killing of the game is also, I mean once they kill the native prey out, you know, it really forces the jaguar to, you know, kill livestock.

So I had, there we go, you know, there's a lot of challenges, you know in the jaguar conflict habitat loss being number one - the competition like for the native prey base.

The weak institutions, you know, your government institutions are not funded through any hunting revenues or anything so they're just when they're really weak - in fact we take them with us to relocate the cats, we got to go pick them up, pay for their - you know, they don't really even have trucks down there.

So it's not that the countries are poor. It's just their game agencies are just underfunded because there's no revenue flow. Government corruption obviously in Latin America but our countries not as bad as some. And, you know, a lot of this is lack of cooperation with the government cooperation with landowners

You know, being from Texas I'm used to, you know, Texas parks and wildlife you go and, you know, they'll help you setup quotas or setup programs. And so , you know, it's not an adversarial relationship like it is in South America where, you know, you have, when you see somebody from the ministry, it's usually bad news. You don't even want them on your ranch in something you're violating or they're looking for something.

Need to go back but anyway need to go back to the other slide. I don't even know how to go back. Let's see. There it is. No I found it. You know there are ways to minimize the conflict, you know, through electric fencing on smaller areas or smaller ranches.

But like I say, a lot of these ranches are 100,000 acres or above so that's not really a viable option. Better cattle management techniques where you rotate

your cattle away from, you know, your calves, you know, from the bigger brush areas. Keep your pastures clean.

At this time there's just no economic incentive for landowners to protect their prey base. And, you know, ranchers need some kind of avenue through, you know, some kind of legal hunting even if we start off, you know, with just prey based animals.

And then a legal solution for landowners for habitual problem jaguars And I think that's the biggest possibility. I mean even the government institutions when they start to remove these really problem cats they're realizing, you know, it's just too much. There's too much effort. Too much money.

And, you know, you could just see their eyes opening. Well if we can sell this for 75,000 or \$100,000, just a few, you know, really problem cats, then, you know, put that money back into conservation. So, you know, they're on the cusp of (unintelligible).

They're also really close, you know, in Paraguay this year. I've been fighting this battle a long time but they finally passed siting laws for siting two animals and below and they're sitting on the President's desk to sign.

So and if you could ever just start off with the baby steps, just getting honey in a country, you know, legal and then you can graduate to something bigger like the jaguar which I think is a possibility.

You know the future for a healthy population is reproduction and, you know, the jaguar is a super-hearty animal. You know, they could take a lot of, you know, a high mortality loss. And what's really neat about them, if they're just source populations they could reoccupy habitat.

I mean as long as the habitat is still there I mean there's a, you know, the jaguar's not an endangered animal by I mean any means. It's maybe threatened in some areas but, you know, from Mexico to Argentina there's still big pockets of viable jaguar population.

So, you know, it's just a viable tool. It's just to use them instead of saving them to death you know, to be able to utilize their ability to reoccupy habitat. You know, and even the state of Texas, you know, I've looked at – obviously we're originally from Texas. I mean jaguars are from South Texas.

They were killed that way back in the 20s through government funded predator control programs and then just the makeup of landowners back then when they, you know, all get together and have dogs and go catch them.

But, you know, there's a huge hog problem down South Texas. South Texas is still made up of big private ranchers and I've always wondered, why not use a predator like the jaguar to control the big hog problem they have but anyway.

And it wouldn't even take jaguars from another country. I mean you can pin raise jaguars, build a pen, habituate them to hogs and just release the offspring to, you know, learn how to hunt. But anyway the jaguar is like I say, is not an endangered animal. It's just a threatened animal.

I think in Paraguay, if any country could do it, I mean that's the one country that's – well not the one country but it's probably the most, the closest to any country that we could have, you know, legal hunting of jaguars.

Anyway, I'm ready for your questions.

Man: Thanks (Rocky). I'm one that's been to your place. I know the prey base is large there. You have a lot of tapers, a lot of hesalinas. A lot of deer. It's all free range obviously but the habitat is such and it's large enough that the prey base exists and therefore the cats exist as well. And you don't have a lot of the predation on cattle but they have, you know, the areas.

(Rocky): That's very true. I mean the prey base I mean people ask me. I study on this with ranchers all the time. The best way to minimize predation is, you know, a large prey base but there has to be some incentive usually for I mean, for ranchers to build the waterholes on their ranches, to do the things that, you know, enable a prey base, you know, the (capybaras), other stuff to occupy that to minimize a loss.

Man: You also mentioned when we were there, Paraguay essentially has no enforcement at the moment.

(Rocky): There's not a game warden in the country.

Man: There's not a game warden in the country.

((Crosstalk))

(Rocky): (Unintelligible) prosecuted for killing a jaguar.

((Crosstalk))

Man: So if they are moving toward hunting on the ...

((Crosstalk))

Man: ... and lower and suddenly those rocket deer, et cetera have some value, won't that encourage those landowners then to ...

((Crosstalk))

(Rocky): Sure. Absolutely.

Man: And hopefully have some money for enforcement on stopping the jaguar killing. At the same time, encourage the landowners to have a larger prey base and that ought to solve some of the predation problems ...

(Rocky): Sure.

Man: ... with the jaguars. I also notice you got a lot of mountain lions down there, ocelots, jaguarondi, probably a few assorted things we didn't see. But I can see where, if there's plenty of natural food, they're less likely to go start selling cattle.

And if they can more toward this enforcement of the law in having limited hunting on the prey base, increase a larger prey base that has to help the whole situation.

(Rocky): Absolutely, it would help the whole system. You know, I've been encouraging that. We just formed a, it's called hungers Paraguay group. And it's a bunch of landowners. It's basically like the baby steps for SEI or something in Paraguay.

But we're actually looking at, you know, joining an affiliate, either Dallas or safari, I mean one of the safari clubs. But anyway at the moment we just have hunters Paraguay. And it's quite a bunch of influential landowners and stuff

that, you know, have access to the higher, you know, high-end government officials.

They're the ones that have been finally able to pass this law. We've been trying to do this for ten years and we finally got the laws. Congress approved it. It's signed – it's waiting for the President's signature. Unfortunately we just had a new administration come in. They got to get familiar with everything but anyway it's – well we're close and you know it is baby steps.

But I think once you realize, you know, hunting and sports hunting in a country like that that's made up of landowners and most of the, even the Administration, you know, President is a landowner. I mean they realize, you know, you know, the value of that then.

You know, and I think we can graduate to finally, you know, jaguars – I didn't realize that jaguars were going to be a controversial subject just because it's been so long it's been banned.

But, you know, in the end, you know, it's (biology) means anything and, you know we can – and, you know the predation program that we've got going of relocation the problem jaguars and just realizing the cost and how difficult that is, you know, I think is the next step.

Man: Yes, if I remember right you told me there is an estimate. I'm sure it's I guess around 1000 jaguars?

(Rocky): A thousand to 1500 jaguars in the country.

Man: If I remember right too, you estimated there were probably 2 to 300 killed per year by farmers and ...

(Rocky): That's a declining number because there's less all the time but yes, it's still – I mean the big rangers employ what they call (unintelligible). I mean they're just people that go hunting jaguars and hunting lions. That's their job.

Man: Well in my state of Oklahoma we had very little game and so we finally got some strong game laws in place in the early 40's. There were virtually no deer, no turkeys and once we got them in place and started a controlled hunting program, we now have incredible numbers. In fact people are saying there are enough at this point.

(Rocky): That's the same in Texas. Texas is down to 4000, 5000 at one time, you know. Now there is a population of 6 million so.

Man: Yes, you must have enforcement. You must have good laws and you must have people that will follow those laws.

(Rocky): Sure.

Man: (Without question).

(Rocky): It's an incentive. You know, when there's 400,000 whitetails in Texas there was no incentive. They were just food. You know, they started trophy hunting them and people started you know, recreational hunting. You know, that's when they gave it a value. Landowners tried to raise deer, you know, kill them for kicks.

Man: (Rocky), I have a question. So in wildlife biology, you know, one tool for a manager to repatriate animals from an overpopulated ecosystem to

(unintelligible) areas, one of the problems in Africa is the fact that nobody really wants all the excess elephant that we find in Zimbabwe and Botswana.

But that's not necessarily the case with respect to jaguar. I don't know whether or not you can classify a population that's otherwise overpopulated. But, you know, I know the northern extremes of the jaguar range of the United States. A couple of them popped up in Arizona in the last five or ten years.

I would expect the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services is somewhat interested in maybe some repopulation and probably a bunch of others that don't. But my question goes to the enabling the repatriation of endangered species. Does that help or prevent the repatriation?

In its current implementation, is the ESA getting in the way of repopulating jaguars in old (unintelligible) areas?

(Rocky0: Sure, I mean that's the biggest problem is landowners say and I've talked to several landowners. Large landowners have quite a bit of influence that you know - they're really interested in doing it.

They don't want the jaguars for two reasons. They think they're going to kill their trophy white tail deer which is not a fact. I mean the jaguars don't even really kill deer. That's not their prey base. They're into the (peckers), (peckery), you know, kind of (unintelligible) and slower type animals. The mountain lions are the ones that are going to kill your white tail deer.

And secondly, nobody wants an endangered species on their ranch where it's controlled by somebody. You know, if they would even give them an experimental status it would be viable, you know. But you have large spaces

like the east bound nations and stuff, several hundred thousand acres full of wild pigs.

They spend millions a year flying and try to get rid of the wild pig population and, you know, you can have a natural predator to do that.

Man: So you think a down-listing of jaguar from the ESA listing could actually result in an increase in the population of jaguars in this hemisphere?

(Rocky): Oh yes.

Man: Why?

(Rocky): Well first of all well none of these persons would get a CITES permit. You're talking about a Paraguay. First of all, you know, the institutions are so weak in a lot of the countries in South America like Paraguay, there's not a CITES office in the country.

There's one lady that has, you know, that can assign a CITES permit or not but the biggest problem is just they've – you know, so many of these NGOs capitalize, they make more money off of the fear that jaguars are going to go extinct.

Or, I mean, they – that's a money generating avenue. Well in 30 years or 10 yeas the jaguar is going to be extinct unless, you know, you donate \$20 to this or, you know,whatever.

So you have a lot of opposition from national NGOs. We have been working with the local WCS in Paraguay. They have an office there, WWF. They're the ones.

When you can finally convince them the local ones that, you know, there's got to be some, you know, you've got to do something different or you're just going to, you know, starve them to death. I mean there's not really a good policy.

Man: You know, (Rocky), in the western United States the mountain lions have been brought back and given a game animal status. Of course it's huntable and, but it's much bigger than just giving them a game animal status.

It's the user base pays for most law enforcement – the hunters and fishermen buy the licenses and those fees pay for law enforcement. In a place where inherent value or potential trophy value of the animal is not worth saving it but the game fees for the other animals – there one in Tcherkistan where tourists are hunting (acropolo) or paying to save the snow leopard.

(Dan Taylor) documented it very well. The snow leopard in Tcherkistan are doing well to the hunting of the other species.

(Rocky): Right.

Man: And law enforcement the other species are paying for so it's a user pay system. So if they do in fact open up some hunting and then they have revenue for the wildlife department like the rest of the world hunters will pay for most of the law enforcement.

(Rocky): Sure, most of the so-called anti-poachers.

Man: You'll have at least a partial system to start with all your reference for these years will pay-off. Thank you very much.

(Rocky): Yes, sir.

Man: Maybe I missed it. The transport of the mountain lion you had over the saddle of the horse and then another one (that) seemed to be alive.

(Rocky): Yes, that's what I was going to say. We were relocating those mountain lions, yes.

Man: But you had a live mountain lion around your shoulders.

(Rocky): Well they're tranquilized.

Man: But he's still enough awake to keep his head up.

(Rocky): Yes, well it's kind of like right before we get him to the truck we can put him in a pen. You don't want to give him another shot but they're starting to wake up. You know how it is.

((Crosstalk))

Man: He was still awake because he still had his head up.

(Rocky): Yes, he was just starting to process. It's not like they instantly attack you so.

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Rocky): Ah ha, I had one wake up in a truck and I didn't have drug. And then yes.

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Rocky): Yes

((Crosstalk))

Man:: Any other questions or comments for (Rocky) or his presentation. (Rocky) thanks very much to you and (Monica) ...

(Rocky): Yes, thank you.

Man: ... for your presentation. Okay. The next thing on the agenda says panel – council discussion. Anybody got any great and wonderful ideas to discuss at this time? (Ivan).

(Ivan): Can I just make a comment that I think that this last presentation just shows that it's almost to the point where people could have done each other's presentation. We're hearing exactly the same message from each country.

Each country is facing the same issues. Each country is trying their very best to do the best they can with their management. They are asking out and asking scientists for a very strong scientific foundation to their decision-making. And actually very often the only stumbling block is regulatory stuff that's coming from the first world not from inside those countries.

(Bill): Agreed. And I think while each presentation was a little different each country's problems are a little unique to it. Many of the problems are similar. Many of the solutions are similar. And I'm glad to hear the presentations especially by the Africans as to the problems that they're facing and the solutions that they see that can be helpful.

Everyone was very positive on wildlife conservation. As ones who love wildlife they've been involved for most of their lives, it is great to see a true, pure interest in scientific approach to wildlife. Shall we go ...

Man 4: What I would add to that (Bill) is what was carried over from one to the other being more specific about it was the rural people. We heard from Africa they're communal people. All right but it's rural people.

Whether or not they're in Paraguay, West Texas ranchers, the long term survival of wildlife us dependent upon the tolerance and incentives of rural people over and over and over again.

And the programs that USAID had funded, you know, I think we've got to give the State Department some credit anyway. WWF used to get their funding and put it on the ground with the communities that you heard about.

WWF did start a camp fire program in millions of US dollars in that program and has so much instituted but to broadcast it once it was successful, I run into campfire people in Paraguay. In fact (Rocky) might remember that.

USAID was paying for the campfire people to be in Paraguay to tell the community how to save their wildlife. And I run into them in Asia, everywhere. So thank you.

Man: Okay, the next thing on our agenda is Day 2 Public Comments. Do we have anybody listed on public comments? (Harry)?

(Harry): Yes, we have (Ana Seidman) from (unintelligible) Club International signed up to speak.

Man: Okay.

(Ana Seidman): I apologize, everyone. It is my motto never to let a public comment opportunity go by without taking advantage of it.

First of all I want to just quickly address (Chris), your suggestion about perhaps an experimental population of jaguars.

I would just be a little cautious at this time. Recent ruling out of the Arizona District Court on the Mexican wolf experimental population I think has perhaps made everyone, the States particularly take pause about whether they want to be involved with any experimental population since the Court in that case has not only reversed or has remanded the rule about the Mexican wolf population, unhappy with what the Fish and Wildlife Service has done.

And has suggested in that circumstance and it would be the first one ever that a non-essential experimental population might have to be an experimental population. I think if that happens there isn't a state that would accept a reintroduction of experimental populations if they get stuck or if they agree to accept a species at one level and end up with a much higher protection for that species.

So I hope it's something we can reverse in the not too distant future. I also wanted to thank those who referenced the unfortunately named Cecil or Cecil Act that Congressman (Grohova) introduced a couple of days ago.

I often why there isn't a (Quinns Whales) Act. Anybody know who (Quinns Whales) is? He was the poor guide who was killed a few weeks after Cecil. He was a photo tours and guide and he was killed by a lion in the same area or

generally the same area protecting his clients but nobody ever talks about the human that was killed by a lion

Everybody knows Cecil. You're absolutely correct that one of the components of this bill would be to impose restrictions and bans on species that we clearly have learned through the presentations today are benefitting from hunting and making it impossible for U.S. hunters to import legally hunted animals.

I think it's somewhat ironic that the bill that Congressman (Grohodo) is attempting to or has introduced is supposed to be an amendment of the ESA. And the ESA and there have been several references to it during the course of this meeting but I'll, you know, run the risk of being repetitive and remind everyone that the ESA is a relatively unique law.

Unlike many other laws that deal with wildlife conservation it doesn't simply ask the US government to consult with its partners or cooperate with its partners. Section 15.37 actually states the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is supposed to encourage foreign governments' conservation efforts.

And thought it does not specifically say they should not discourage by taking away major sources of funding, and taking away the incentives for community based management, I think we can all assume that that's implied – that to do what Congressman (Grohodo) and others are trying to do by creating barriers and restrictions would undermine what Congress originally put in place.

The other element that wasn't of the bill that wasn't mentioned and so far I don't think by anyone is a component that wants to do away with this council. What's to be afraid of? I don't get it. I mean what this council has done for me anyway over the last two days is bring in science from you know, a number of very, very important sources.

And that science isn't just for us and so I get to the point of my comment – is that this council has a charter that tells it that it's supposed to make recommendations to the secretary. And I would suggest that what this council could do is ask the secretary or recommend to the secretary that he send a letter to Congressmen (Groholdo) and say, if you want to do away with the council, shouldn't you first come and see what we're doing?

See what, you know, see what goes on at these meetings? I mean why would you want to do away with the introduction of science? It's probably far-fetched and I'm always a normal, contained individual. I do come up with far-fetched ideas.

But I sure think that if somebody is going to say, don't bring information in, they should at least know what kind of information is coming in. Thank you.

Man: (Anna), thank you. We happened to be in Zimbabwe at Wanke that ten days to two weeks after the Cecil incident. And we were there when the young man that was the photographic guide was killed. He happened to have five Americans that he was guiding.

The lion attempted to charge and then acted like he was backing away. And the young man turned to try and get the Americans out of the way and the lion killed him.

Also while we were there, there was an elephant that trampled a couple of natives and it pointed out the human animal conflicts even more. Living with large animals is not easy and that was another reason that I was super pleased that we were able to get Africans here to tell us their thoughts on the issues of

the day and to get African voices, African ideas on the solutions to many of the problems that are out there.

We as a council are directed to help come up with and make some recommendations to the secretary. I don't know how we can make recommendations on something without getting voices from the people that are directly affected by it. And I think we've had incredible presentations from the people that have been here.

(Rocky), thanks for giving us South America's perspective as well. But it's our duty to gather all the information that we can and I'm quite pleased with the information that we've gathered. Anyone else have a comment?

Do we have anyone else that's a presenter?

Man: We do not.

Man: Okay, if there's no other business to come before the council, (Christa), we would accept a motion to adjourn.

Motion to adjourn by (Mike Ingram).. Do I have a second?

(Lucette): Second.

Man: Second from (Lucette Field) All those in favor, leave.

((Crosstalk))

Man:                   Actually those on the council, you can't leave. I need to do some DFO  
business with you for just a second so as for the rest of the room, please, you  
are excused. If you can vacate so I can closeout with the council.

((Crosstalk))

END