
AFRICAN  INDABA

Volume 5 Number 5

eNewsletter

September 2007

Dedicated to the People and Wildlife of Africa

Web: www.africanindaba.co.za

E-Mail: indaba@cic-wildlife.org

Postal Address: P. O. Box 411 – Rivonia 2128 – South Africa

Tanzania: Facts and Rumors

Is there an alternative to "Use it AND Loose it"?

Gerhard R Damm¹

Africa Indaba supports - in line with major international Conventions - a conservation policy which combines conservation of natural resources, in particular wildlife, with sustainable use. In a simplification of a complex issue, this is packed into the phrase "*Use it OR Loose it*".

Tanzania followed this philosophy and fared quite well as compared to neighboring Kenya, which has banned hunting 30 years ago and which has lost 70 % of its wildlife during that time. In the past years, we heard frequent news about bad Governance in wildlife management and hunting in Tanzania with negative consequences for the conservation of wild areas and wildlife. Now the issue became the focus of public debate and controversy in Tanzania. Coupled with critical reports about increasing poaching and hunting areas, which are turned into photographic safari areas by the local communities, one could ask whether the country presently follows a policy leading to "*Use it AND Loose it*" rather than "*Use it OR Loose it*"!

Since African Indaba champions the "*Use it OR Loose it*" philosophy we provide readers with information about the recent development and with background material. We have collated news reports in the first part of this article and condensed the main findings of relevant papers on hunting and conservation in Tanzania in the second part. In the third part we are offering suggestions on how to achieve a win-

¹ The author is the editor of African Indaba, a bi-monthly e-Newsletter on hunting and conservation in Africa. This article was first published in the September/October 2007 issue of African Indaba. All issues of African Indaba are available free of charge at the African Indaba Website www.africanindaba.co.za (go to archive links).

win situation for the Tanzanian Government, the rural communities who live with wildlife, the hunting operators and the visiting hunters and last not least the wildlife of Tanzania.

Part 1: What happened in the past three months?

The Minister of Finance's remarks in her budget speech were a first indication: *"it is proposed to review the rates for various fees and charges imposed by the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism (MNRT) to bring them in line with current prices and protect our natural resources ... to generate Shillings 33,616 million in additional revenue"* and *"... the proposed measures shall become effective on 1st July 2007. The House Committee appealed to the Minister of Natural Resources and Tourism to speed up the review of the national legislation on wildlife management and recommended that the revised legislation incorporate more effective structures and mechanisms to check the misuse of wildlife resources saying "... that the government should set up a special agency to deal with all hunting-related activities. The move would allow the ministry's Wildlife Department more room to concentrate on policy and legal issues, including the management of protected areas, game reserves and national parks"*.

A letter from the MNRT Wildlife Division, dated 11th July, signed by F. Lyimo informed the global hunting world of the increase in government concession fees and license cost. The letter was accompanied by Government Notice No 159, dated and published on 29th June 2007, referring to the Wildlife Conservation Act (CAP 283) and stating that the Hunting Regulations 2005 in particular the Third Schedule has been revoked and substituted. This was accompanied by a list of Hunting Blocks (Category A with a minimum area of 800 km² and Category B with a minimum area of 100 km²) and the new concession Fees of US\$50,000 (A) respectively US\$40,000 (B) and a list with "Game Fees" for the huntable species and the fee structure for rifle/shotgun hunting and bow hunting (the bow hunting fees being double the rifle/shotgun fees). The fee structure sheet is signed by the MNRT Minister Jumanne A Maghembe and dated 27th June 2007. Apparently this was sent to all hunting concession holders in Tanzania.

Some safari operators and in particular the Chairman of TAHOA, who were contacted by The Hunting Report², immediately dismissed the claim that the new prices would come into effect for the 2007 season which began on July 1st. Other operators reportedly either cut down the hunting days for clients already on safari, or advised booked clients that the increase would have to be met. The Hunting Report informed readers on August 17th that one subscriber said that Zuka Safaris cut his 21-day safari to 11 days because of the new fees. Another subscriber stated that Game Frontiers had demanded payment of the new fees for a safari starting in early September. A refusal would mean forfeiture of all deposits. The Hunting Report qualified the news about Game Frontiers on August 23rd, saying that the company had confirmed that the new game fees will not be implemented this year and *"what appeared to be a disturbing development was simply a miscommunication between*

² The Hunting Report can be accessed at www.huntingreport.com

the agent, the client and the company". In the same communiqué obviously serious shortcomings were reported about safaris of Usangu Safaris, and that hunters reportedly had been told that the concessions they booked are unavailable, unless they pay additional fees of \$15,000 to \$18,000.

Tanzanian media reported that the present director of wildlife, who is near retirement, seems to be under heavy pressure to allocate hunting blocks as political patronage. According to these sources there is a strong demand for hunting blocks by people outside the hunting industry. Allegedly these people are looking for a quick profit through sub-leasing. Back in the 90's sub-letting had led to a subdivision of hunting blocks and to unsustainable quota increases. In June the Tanzanian paper ThisDay mentioned that *"the real culprits have been left untouched"* after an earlier reshuffle in MNRT. The same paper wrote that some well-connected individuals have been monopolizing licenses for hunting blocks, which they covertly sublet to foreign hunting companies for exorbitant fees. Most of the criticism fell on the Wildlife Division for favoring a select group of hunting outfitters. The paper cited a research report into the local hunting industry, which claimed widespread corruption and a lack of proper controls by the Wildlife Division thus seriously depleting revenue and excluding communities.

Later in the month an explosive PowerPoint presentation surfaced in Dar Es Salaam and was widely distributed on the internet. The anonymous document purports to expose some of the corrupt practices in the hunting industry. Speculations ran wild about the author or authors; insiders, who seem to know the author(s), say that the source(s) are reputable and reliable. The same insiders say that many of the allegations are based on facts, although some are evidently made without presenting proof. Other reports spoke of a number of cancellations of hunting safaris and of *"Professional Hunters hanging around in Dar"*. These sources linked the price increases to an effort of self defense of a "cornered" administration under very high pressure, being accused of "institutionalized" corruption by the press and in Parliament.

Representatives of the hunting industry in Tanzania frantically attempted to meet with the minister to initiate a dialogue on how to solve an apparent impasse. They claimed that the increase could not be enforced in 2007, given that a previously agreed notice period had not been honored. TAHOA's arguments cited a 1994 document that was signed between the Stakeholders and the Wildlife Division, whereby hunting companies should have a 9 months' notice period regarding any price hike. Legal advice taken by TAHOA claimed that the sudden price increases breached this agreement.

Around August 14th, an email from the TAHOA Secretary General was sent to all TAHOA members saying *"The Office of the President has directed that TAHOA, on behalf of all hunting companies, has to sit with The Hon. Minister of Natural Resources and Tourism in order to resolve the issue of Block fees and Trophy Fees as announced in GN. 159 dated 29th June 2007 and promulgated on 11th July 2007."* On August 24th the Tanzanian paper ThisDay reported that the MNRT flatly rejected to rethink the increases despite vigorous lobbying pressure. The Minister reportedly said that the revised game hunting fees were in line with prevailing rates in the rest of the 14-member Southern African Development Community. He

asserted that hunting companies were using the blocks "almost free of charge," with a typical hunting block in the Selous Game Reserve of 100,000 hectares costing actually \$0.5 per hectare.

In an email bulletin of the same date, The Hunting Report classified ThisDay as tabloid with a history of anti-hunting stories. The Hunting Report said not to take the ThisDay report as the final word and cited TAHOA's chairman Gerard Pasanisi "*this situation is still open and TAHOA is ready to sit down next week [ed. note: last week August] with specialists from the minister's office to discuss the problem of fee increases.*" Insiders, however, are stating that although ThisDay may be considered tabloid, it is not anti-hunting, but anti-corruption.

The internet forum "Accurate Reloading Forum³" has a number of posts on the situation. Of significance is a post by US agent Atkinson Hunting Adventures saying that "*we have been booking [buffalo] at the new price and see very little effect*". One participant posted: "*What I can't understand is why Tanzania doesn't have an open auction process for concessions and allow foreign companies to bid. With a 5 year lease and a rotating auction schedule so at least a few concessions come up for auction every year Tanzania would get fair [market value]. With a fixed price of \$50K some concessions may be under-priced while others may be over-priced. Tanzania will still lose revenue on under-priced concessions. Tanzania needs to fix its tender process, until it does, they will continue to have problems.*"

To make matters worse, MNRT had officially applied to sell 100 tons of ivory ahead of the recent CITES Conference of Parties, but withdrew just before a CITES inspection was due and after major irregularities of the management of the ivory stocks, including the sale of stamped tusks, became public knowledge. Due to bad Governance and the apparent involvement of the army and WD there is real danger that poaching for meat and ivory may again reach levels as in the 70s and 80s again. That would destroy wildlife including elephants in large numbers⁴.

Part 2: A Review of Relevant Papers

Possibly the most significant paper about hunting in Tanzania was published in July 2004, authored by Dr. Rolf Baldus, at that time working for the Community Wildlife Management Program of the German Gesellschaft fuer Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ) and by Andrew Cauldwell, who was with the EU-funded Kagera Kigoma Game Reserves Project (EDF). Titled "Tourist Hunting and its Role in Development of Wildlife Management Areas in Tanzania", all three parts can be downloaded from the African Indaba website⁵.

³ The Accurate Reloading Forums can be accessed at <http://forums accuratereloading.com/eve>

⁴ Why Tanzania was well advised to withdraw its proposal to CITES to sell 100 tons of ivory by R D Baldus, African Indaba Volume 5, Number 4

⁵ Tourist Hunting and its role in Tanzania, R D Baldus & A Cauldwell, African Indaba Vo -5. Full text version at http://www.africanindaba.co.za/Conservation/baldus_cauldwell_2004_part1.pdf
http://www.africanindaba.co.za/Conservation/baldus_cauldwell_2004_part2.pdf
http://www.africanindaba.co.za/Conservation/baldus_cauldwell_2004_part3.pdf

Fred Nelson from the Sand County Foundation Community Based Conservation Network, Simon Milledge of TRAFFIC East Africa, Dr Allan Rodgers, Regional Coordinator (Eastern Africa) UNDP–GEF Biodiversity Projects, the Tanzania Development Partners Group (DPG) and many others have also documented the problems, risks and potential solutions for the wildlife sector in Tanzania for years⁶.

The lack of an objective and transparent system for the allocation of hunting blocks has as consequence that blocks are leased at administered prices far below the true market value irrespective of size, quality or income potential. This represents a large loss of income to Tanzania.

The “official” complaints about the “insignificant” contribution of trophy hunting to the Tanzanian GDP fail to see that the safari hunting revenue has to be viewed not in isolation, but in connection with related items like travel, hotels, payments to outfitters, taxidermy, freight forwarding, air charter, souvenirs, tips, etc as well as the taxes paid to the State. By using multiplier effects, the hunting industry’s contribution probably has been in excess of 130 million dollars in 2006.

All authors basically arrive at the same findings and similar conclusions – and we list some in no particular order:

- ✓ Despite the hunting sector’s impressive growth little information and data are available, and even though a confidential report with empirical economic data was presented to WD in 2004, there was no response;
- ✓ WD uses a control system based on favoritism leading to reduced income generation for the country, excludes rural communities and resists efforts to introduce transparency and competition, whilst attempts to discuss the issues in public are curbed;
- ✓ a tourist hunting policy and management plan to introduce competition and to incorporate communities as decision-makers was developed, signed and accepted by the Director of Wildlife in 1995, but has never been implemented. Legislative changes do not adequately reflect the proposals.;
- ✓ concessions are leased at rates far below market value, favoring the development of a system of subletting to non-Tanzanian companies and

⁶ Seeking Conservation Partnerships in the Selous Game Reserve, Tanzania, R D Baldus, B. Kibonde & L Siege http://www.africanindaba.co.za/Conservation/baldus_kibonde_siege_2003.pdf

Introducing a Debate on the Reform of Safari Hunting, Baldus & Cauldwell, African Indaba Vol 3-3

How Tanzania can benefit from SADC Best Practices, S Milledge, TRAFFIC, African Indaba Vol 3-3

Safari Hunting Certification by R D Baldus and A Cauldwell, African Indaba Vol 3-3

Hunting, Sustainability, and Property Rights in East & Southern Africa, F Nelson et al, AI, Vol 3-4

Tanzania: Reduce the Quotas or Reform? By A Cauldwell, African Indaba, Vol 3- 4

Tanzania Development Partners Group (DPG), African Indaba Volume 4-1

www.wildlifeprogramme.gtz.de/wildlife/download/dpgwildlifebrief.pdf

Tourist Hunting in Tanzania: Issues Behind the Issues, Allan Rodgers, African Indaba Vol 4-2

Making Wildlife Work for Tanzania’s Communities, Charles Nzo Mmbaga, African Indaba Vol 4-3

Development of Community Wildlife Management in Tanzania, M T Walsh

www.mbomipa.info/downloads/the_development_of_cwm_in_tz_2000.pdf

Land use planning and resource assessment in Tanzania, A S Kauzeni

www.poptel.org.uk/iied/docs/spa/epi3.pdf

reducing the tax-base of the Government. Hunting revenue is based on a "Pay-as-Used", rather than "Right-to-Use" system. This has not changed despite political pressure to capture revenue potentials and real market value;

- ✓ calls for a transparent public tender process for hunting blocks with block fees charged according to open market values went unheard;
- ✓ the sector is suffering from sub-optimal management including a lack of normative hunting standards, monitoring of sustainable quotas, fair chase parameters, sustainable management of hunting blocks and limited participation of rural communities. Signs of unsustainable growth through block-division and expatriation of revenue are apparent, with neither Government nor communities receiving what is due to them according to Tanzanian law;
- ✓ the financial administration of the Tourist Hunting Section in the WD was computerized in the mid-nineties with financial assistance from a donor country at the request of MNRT, but never applied;
- ✓ that hunting blocks have been "allocated" on non-gazetted lands i.e. around Ruaha National Park, the Ngarambe-Tapika area south of the Rufiji, etc usurping village based wildlife enterprises, such as the Ngarambe-Tapika interim WMA against the principles of the 1998 Wildlife Policy document;
- ✓ that trophy hunting feeds funds only into central government with little filtering back into districts or to villages although the Wildlife Policy says *"wildlife benefits must flow back into the village communities who bear the costs of living with wildlife"*;
- ✓ neither the WD, the individual hunting outfitters, TAHOA nor the international hunting associations took proactive steps towards a reform process with a general reluctance notable amongst hunting safari outfitters to accept the WMA concept and effectively empower local communities;
- ✓ that biological, financial and hunt-return data, including monitoring of minimum trophy standards, for the adaptive management of the industry have not been integrated in a national hunting database. Minimum trophy size requirement for elephant, lion and leopard trophies are sometimes not enforced and sustainable trophy standards for buffalo have not been introduced;
- ✓ conservation basics, law and hunting ethics are frequently subordinated to market requirements, or in other words, to the high-fee-paying hunting tourist's will and whim⁷. Serious efforts to prosecute violations are absent, despite a personal letter of the Director of Wildlife to every PH and hunting operator in 2005, saying *"there are reports about some professional hunters failing to pay serious attention to the law, regulations and guidelines used in the administration of safari hunting industry in Tanzania"*;
- ✓ that game viewing tourism and hunting safaris can be well combined in most areas, thus optimizing the revenue base, provided that protocols are established to regulate the interaction of both.

⁷ Tupa Nyuma Hunting, Ian Parker, African Indaba Vol 3 Nr 2

Is there a solution?

The events of the last three months can be described as implosion of a dysfunctional system, which begged for reform, but with the major players unable or unwilling to drive change. The resulting turmoil could also be viewed as a last opportunity for reform, as the consequences for not acting will be disastrous for wildlife, conservation and rural communities. Stakeholders need to think outside the box, forget the past and build a sustainable future. Those resisting reform will have to shoulder the responsibility of failure.

The history of the past 10 years has shown that commissions, stakeholder dialogue, round tables, policy development, and expert papers have brought no results, despite the members of the Development Partner Group (DPG) and the Government having spent millions of dollars and countless man-hours. Problems have been discussed and analyzed *ad nauseam* and solutions have been presented, but were ignored and policies have not been put into practice. The present Wildlife Policy reflects the goal to conserve wildlife and wild areas and to contribute to poverty reduction. Only minor parts of this Policy need to be adapted to changed circumstances, but the Government must make the political decision to introduce and enforce the policy. This decision has to come right from the top – i. e. the President's and the Vice-President's office as the elected representatives of people of Tanzania who are the owners of the wildlife resource, held in trust by their Government.

Nobody denies the fact the safari hunting industry needs to accept long overdue pricing adjustments to generate maximum sustainable hunting revenue for the country. Even substantially higher block lease costs will not necessarily drive up end-user hunting prices, although such a step would certainly affect excessive profit margins of some companies and certain practices deviating huge amounts into individual pockets. Yet, it must be permitted to say that price increases promulgated by MNRT in July do not address the basic problems inherent in the present system, nor do they offer a long term solution:

- Blocks lease costs (from \$7,500 to \$10,000 2 years ago and now at \$40,000 respectively \$50,000) still do not reflect the true economic value of the hunting block. Some blocks may be worth less, others substantially more;
- block adjudication is not subject to independent control, lacks transparency and disregards the principle that the optimal price is a competitive market-price. As the highest bidder is not necessarily the ideal candidate, adjustments along an agreed set of rules and regulations can be made by the tender committee⁸;
- the revenue obtained by the WD is still based on a "Pay-as-Used" instead of on a "Right-to-Use" system, and since major revenue streams still

⁸ Compare "Bwabwata Hunting Concessions in Namibia Welcome Hunters", Gerhard Damm, African Indaba Vol 4-3 and the WWF-Report about the tender process in the Bwabwata Concession in Namibia at www.irdnc.org.na/download/Caprivi%20Report%20July%2006%20to%20Dec%2006.doc

come from trophy fees there is a tendency to overhunt quotas and wildlife populations;

- the “Pay-as-Used” system permits some hunting operators to restrict the number of exclusive safaris in prime areas. Their price structure allows working with minimum safari days and low off-take of trophy animals whilst maximizing economic return, thus reducing the Government’s income.

Moreover, the presentation and introduction date of the price increase after the hunting season had begun may be described as unwise, although insiders say that most of the current block holders can still afford the higher block fees. These sources also say “the process showed the Wildlife Division’s lack of understanding on how the hunting industry works”. Some insiders even suggest that “block contracts should be cancelled en masse, and the current holders invited to submit bids to the WD suggesting a revised fee”. The WD can then enter a memorandum of understanding with the operators in the interim while the rest of the recommendations are implemented.

It is therefore suggested that the Government of Tanzania rescind the promulgated 2007 season increases and instead look for an optimal solution from 2008 onwards. With political will and immediate action a solution based on the proposals listed at the end of this chapter could be ready for implementation in the first quarter of 2008 well ahead of the start of the 2008 season. A parallel media campaign could be started in late December to transparently inform the global hunting market.

I submit that even a substantially higher increase in block leases, coupled with stable and market-related trophy fees would not necessarily drive up end-user prices, although it would certainly affect possibly excessive profit margins of some. We live in a competitive world; although nobody is denying the operators a reasonable profit margin, the international hunting associations – as responsible hunter-conservationists – should make sure that a substantial part of the funds paid for hunting safaris goes towards conservation and poverty alleviation of Tanzania. This route will result in a "win-win" situation for all.

Safari operators need to rethink pricing strategy and like in any other industry, must embark on strict cost saving measures in order to obtain an adequate profit margin. We also need price clarity in a way that safari prices (daily rates) should be inclusive of all extras, like hunting permit fees, block fees, conservation fees, community fees and trophy handling- preparation- and export-fees. Safari operators, who hold prime hunting blocks are entitled to charge premium prices for their services and the market will certainly accept this.

The Government should request transparency about concession lease holders, sub-letting of blocks, infrastructure costs, staff remuneration, office and administrative cost, marketing expenses, and the final destination of the funds paid by the hunting client, etc. It is the legitimate right of the Tanzanian Revenue Authority (TRA) to levy the appropriate tax on business conducted in the country.

Another issue, which must come under review, is the safari marketing at international shows especially expensive hunt donations. The US convention organizers benefit yearly substantially from booth rentals and donations from safari operators. In 2006, the donation value of safaris in Tanzania to the US convention circuit is estimated to be close to 0.5 million dollars, but very little of this amount flows back into the country. It is suggested that such donations should be done only along the example of the government permits donated by various US States, Mexico and some western Canadian Provinces, where, in the case of mountain sheep, the Foundation for North American Wild Sheep (FNAWS) raised in excess of 5.9 million dollars in the past 3 years. This amount was paid directly to the donating wildlife departments and as such represented real value for conservation⁹.

The International Council for Game and Wildlife Conservation (CIC), a politically independent advisory body involved in broad-based initiatives on Sustainable Hunting Tourism can assist the Government of the United Republic of Tanzania in the reform process. CIC unites Member States (mostly represented by the Ministry responsible for wildlife management and conservation), researchers from universities, organizations engaged in hunting, as well as private members from 81 countries and cooperates with UNEP, FAO etc. and all prominent international conventions with relevance to wildlife conservation and management and is a member of IUCN¹⁰.

In view of these arguments, I would like to present the readers of African Indaba the following multi-pronged approach to reform. I challenge all readers, but in particular international hunting associations like Safari Club International, Dallas Safari Club, Shikar Safari Club, etc. as well as the international hunting media to offer their views in this discussion. Last not least, Tanzania is the crown jewel of African hunting and we all want and need a sustainable and equitable solution.

1. Implement the Tanzania Wildlife Policy

- 1.1. Streamline the Wildlife Policy along the National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty, better known by its Swahili acronym MKUKUTA (*Mkakati wa Kukuza Uchumi na Kuondoa Umaskini Taifa*)¹¹ on how the wildlife sector can contribute to growth, revenue, and poverty reduction objectives along the Government policies of decentralization and democratic control. If necessary, have WD appoint lawyers to review the Act and present a new draft for debate with parliamentarians and civil society. A written agreement with Donor Partners Group on a joint implementation strategy for the MNRT policies would assist in securing full financial support for the Government programs;

⁹ FNAWS 2007, "Recent Activities Report", <http://www.fnaws.org/>

¹⁰ More details about the work of the International Council for Game and Wildlife Conservation can be obtained from the website <http://www.cic-wildlife.org/>

¹¹ For more details on MKUKUTA go to www.tzdpq.or.tz/index.php?id=5 and www.tanzania.go.tz/pdf/nsgprtext.pdf

- 1.2. Appoint a committee to revise and simplify the WMA Regulations so that they can be understood and applied by the rural population and secure WMA participation of WMAs and their members in decision making processes;
- 1.3. Appoint resource economists and an international auditing company to evaluate the block lease system, establish estimated hunting block market values and introduce transparency into the revenue flow within the WD. Create a transparent block tendering process with additional tendering criteria over and above the block price (for details compare the Bwabwata Tender Process in Namibia and the proposed Niassa Game Reserve Tender Process in Mozambique – see Page 7 African Indaba Volume 5, Number 5)¹²; and abolish sub-letting;
- 1.4. Commission an objective scientific examination of the economic, social and ecological consequences of all aspects of safari hunting across representative ecosystems to test the hypothesis that *“well-managed, transparent sport hunting can provide very tangible and quantifiable conservation and social benefits, as well as substantial and sustainable economic gain”*;
- 1.5. Assess funding situation in major game reserves to improve law enforcement and conservation.

2. Initiate Reform of Hunting Industry

- 2.1. Establish a permanent panel of experts with a secretariat at the Mweka Wildlife College in advisory capacity to the Permanent Secretary. Members could be Wildlife Division, the Parliamentary Committee for Lands, Natural Resources and Tourism, TANAPA, NCAA, Institute of Resource Assessment (University of Dar Es Salaam), community/WMA representatives, LEAT, WWF, WCS, independent experts, international hunting associations, organized (TAHOA) and independent hunting safari operators to review present procedures, comment on block allocation, pricing structures, WD hunting management, quota setting, computerization, and a system of self-regulatory certification methods for hunting blocks, safari operators and professional hunters;
- 2.2. join the International Council for Game and Wildlife Conservation CIC as a state member, represented by the Honorable Minister;
- 2.3. establish a system where individual safari operators and the Wildlife Division cooperate to provide annual donations of full bag safaris (incl. of all costs and trophies) to be auctioned at international conventions subject to a reserve price. The convention organizers must commit to pay the Wildlife Division at

¹² Tender process Bwabwata Concession in Namibia at www.irdnc.org.na/download/Caprivi%20Report%20July%202006%20to%20Dec%202006.doc; Tender Process Niassa Game Reserve, Mozambique see advert in African Indaba Volume 5/5, Page 7 and compare <http://niassa.com/article/articlestatic/24/1/7/>

least 90% of the hammer price and such funds will be used entirely for conservation in the hunting block where the safari will be conducted;

- 2.4. consider increased transparency regarding safari price components like infrastructure costs, staff remuneration, office and administrative cost, marketing expenses, and that safari payments arrive in full in the country.

3. Establish Public Trust

- 3.1. Create a Wildlife Division website with important decisions, policy documents, block tender documents, a detailed PH and outfitter register, hunting database, the hunting reform debate, etc in order establish trust nationally and internationally;
- 3.2. Create a hunting database with details of block, quota, success ratio, trophy quality (all trophies to be measured prior to export acc to RW criteria) in cooperation with IUCN Specialist Groups (elephant, cats, crocodiles, antelopes, etc);
- 3.3. Initiate on-the-spot dialogue between the Director of Wildlife and representatives of the major wildlife areas on district and communities level to discuss policy, the WMA concept, sustainable hunting tourism, revenue sharing, problem animal control, etc and distribute the Swahili version of the official Wildlife Policy.

4. Expected Outcome

- 4.1. To generate maximum sustainable hunting revenue from the "Right-to-Hunt", i.e. from hunting block leases adjudicated in a transparent tender process at market values determined by the quality of the block and by the quality and numbers of the game therein, complemented by stable and internationally competitive trophy fees;
- 4.2. to establish appropriate methods to allow properly qualified Tanzanian citizens entrance into the hunting safari industry as partners or professional hunters;
- 4.3. best practices in the tourist hunting industry contribute to biodiversity conservation, safeguard resource sustainability, secure long-term and increased revenue, for the Government, the hunting industry, the local communities and the national economy and thus contribute significantly to poverty reduction.

Tanzania still is one of the best wildlife and hunting destinations in Africa, but this status is threatened, if present trends continue. Change is easy to achieve, if there is political will in Tanzania to do so.

Effective reform of the Wildlife Act will lead to good governance, realize the revenue potential of the industry, share benefits and reduce poverty through implementation the existing WMA concept. This would be a true example of “Incentive-Driven-Conservation” and a proud step along the path shown by the first president of Tanzania, the Honorable Julius Nyerere in his 1961 Arusha Declaration on Wildlife protection.

Acknowledgement:

This article was discussed with several reviewers and contains information received through confidential personal communication.

All referenced African Indaba articles and additional relevant material can be downloaded from <http://www.africanindaba.co.za/conservationafrica.htm> and the African Indaba archive 2003-2007 links.