

Call for evidence on the scale and impacts of the import and export of hunting trophies

Wildlife & Countryside Link response - February 2020

This response is supported by the following organisations:

- Badger Trust
- Born Free Foundation
- Four Paws
- League Against Cruel Sports
- Naturewatch Foundation
- RSPCA
- Whale & Dolphin Conservation

Question 1: What is your name?

Jodie Le Marquand

Question 2: What is your email address?

jodie@wcl.org.uk

Question 3: What is your organisation? If you're replying as an individual, please type 'individual'.

Wildlife & Countryside Link

Question 4: Would you like your response to be confidential? (Required)

No

Question 5: Please provide any evidence you have on the impacts on species conservation and the natural environment of the import and export of hunting trophies to and from the UK.

Studies and reports have increasingly questioned the economic, conservation and societal values of trophy hunting activities, and its sustainability^{1,2,3,4,5}. With money to be made, corrupt practices abound. Animal populations are often manipulated and quotas set to maximise profits, recommended age-based and area-based limitations are frequently ignored⁶, hunting levels often exceed quotas⁷, and much of the funding generated from trophy hunting ends up in the hands of corrupt hunting concession operators, officials, and foreign companies⁸.

Published field studies have brought the conservation credentials of trophy hunting into question in relation to African lions and leopards in Tanzania⁹, lions in Zimbabwe¹⁰, leopards in South Africa¹¹, and elephants across parts of Southern Africa¹², among others.

The report 'Missing the Mark' by the United States Democratic staff of the House Committee on Natural Resources, examined the trophy hunting of African elephants, black and southern white rhinoceros, leopards and lions in Zimbabwe, Tanzania, South Africa and Namibia. It found "*many troubling examples of funds either being diverted from their purpose or not being dedicated to conservation on the first place*"¹³, and concluded that "*corruption within governments or organizations can prevent trophy hunting revenues from funding conservation activities and can even lead to the mismanagement of hunted populations.*"¹⁴

A report prepared for the International Union for the Conservation of Nature/France Partnership in 2018 noted that 40% of the big game hunting zones in Zambia, and 72% in Tanzania, are now classified as "depleted", because of overhunting and agricultural encroachment¹⁵.

Far from removing surplus, decrepit or undesirable animals, trophy hunters often covet the largest trophies with the most impressive traits, which can have a disproportionate impact on the genetic

¹ <http://www.ecolarge.com/work/the-200-million-question-how-much-does-trophy-hunting-really-contribute-to-african-communities/>

² Mkono 2019. "Neo-Colonialism and Greed: Africans' views on Trophy Hunting in Social Media," Journal of Sustainable Tourism 27, no. 5: 689–704. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2019.1604719>

³ Jacquet and Delon, 2016. "The Values behind Calculating the Value of Trophy Hunting," Conservation Biology 30, no. 4 (2016): 910–11. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cobi.12749>

⁴ Batavia et al. 2019. "The Elephant (Head) in the Room: A Critical Look at Trophy Hunting," Conservation Letters 12, no. 1. <https://doi.org/10.1111/conl.12565>

⁵ Ripple et al. 2016. Does Trophy Hunting Support Biodiversity? A Response to Di Minin et Al. Trends in Ecology and Evolution 31, no. 7: 495–96. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2016.03.011>

⁶ Creel et al. 2016. Assessing the sustainability of African lion trophy hunting, with recommendations for policy. Ecological Applications. doi: 10.1002/eap.1377

⁷ http://cmsdata.iucn.org/downloads/iucn_informingdecisionsontrophyhuntingv1.pdf

⁸ http://www.wildlife-baldus.com/download/influence_of_corruption_on_hunting.pdf

⁹ <http://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0005941>

¹⁰ <https://lovewildafrica.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/Loveridge-et-al-2007-impact-of-trophy-hunting-on-lion-population-dynamics-in-Hwange.pdf>

¹¹ <https://africageographic.com/blog/leopard-hunting-quota-was-issued-despite-official-report-showing-significant-population-declines/>

¹² <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/iwmg.641>

¹³ "Missing the Mark: African trophy hunting fails to show consistent conservation benefits", A report by the Democratic staff of the House Committee on Natural Resources, 2016

¹⁴ Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Listing Two Lion Species, 80 Fed Reg. 246 (December 23, 2015). Federal Register

¹⁵ Chardonnet, 2019. "Africa Is Changing: Should Its Protected Areas Evolve? Reconfiguring the Protected Areas in Africa. https://conservationaction.co.za/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/etudesAP_configAP_EN.pdf

and social integrity of their family group or wider populations, and serious adverse impacts on conservation outcomes.^{16,17}

Examination of advertised hunts and awards conferred by major hunting organisations reveals a clear focus on the size and traits of trophies, with little evidence of any effort to encourage hunters to restrict themselves to identified problem or ‘redundant’ animals.¹⁸

The trophy hunting industry has also been implicated in the trafficking of wildlife through so-called ‘pseudo-hunting’, where trophy hunting has been used as a front to facilitate the acquisition and export of valuable parts of protected animals for illegal commercial trade.¹⁹ In January 2018 the new Environment minister of Tanzania accused hunting operators to be involved in poaching and illegal exports of ivory.²⁰ Such associations further undermine the credibility of the trophy hunting industry’s conservation claims, and place vulnerable wildlife populations at increased risk.

Wildlife & Countryside Link strongly aligns itself with the conclusion of the 2017 report by the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN)’s World Commission on Environmental Law (WCEL) Ethics Specialist Group, that *Trophy hunting is not consistent with “sustainable use”*²¹.

For further information, see Born Free’s report entitled “*Trophy Hunting – Busting the Myths and Exposing the Cruelty*”²².

Question 6: Are there greater impacts from the import and export of hunting trophies to and from the UK on some species over others?

Because hunters value rarity, endangered species may be disproportionately targeted, increasing the pressure on already vulnerable populations and potentially pushing them towards extinction.²³ A study by Palazy *et al.* in 2012 suggested that although a protective IUCN Red List status lowers the exploitation of moderately threatened species, hunting pressure on the most threatened species increases. They proposed the possibility of an anthropogenic Allee effect (AAE), a disproportionate exploitation of the rarest species, with the implication that the highly profitable exploitation of rare species could have harmful consequences, unless appropriate management actions and protection rules are enforced.²⁴

¹⁶ Knell R.J. & Martínez-Ruiz C. 2017. Selective harvest focused on sexual signal traits can lead to extinction under directional environmental change. *Proc. Royal Soc. B.* 284 (1868).

<https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2017.1788>

¹⁷ <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s12686-018-0983-6>

¹⁸ <https://www.safariclub.org/world-hunting-awards>

¹⁹ Traffic (2012) The South Africa—Viet Nam Rhino Horn Trade Nexus: A deadly combination of institutional lapses, corrupt wildlife industry professionals and Asian crime syndicates. http://www.traffic.org/species-reports/traffic_species_mammals66.pdf

²⁰ <http://allafrica.com/stories/201801260119.html>

²¹ <https://www.iucn.org/news/world-commission-environmental-law/201909/compatibility-trophy-hunting-a-form-sustainable-use-iucns-objectives>

²² <https://www.bornfree.org.uk/publications/busting-the-myths>

²³ Palazy, L. *et al.* 2011. Cat Dilemma: Too Protected To Escape Trophy Hunting? *PLoS ONE* 6 (7): e22424. doi:10.1371

²⁴ Palazy, L. *et al.* 2012. On the use of the IUCN status for the management of trophy hunting. *Wildlife Research* 39 (8), 711-720. doi: 10.1071/WR12121

While trophy hunting may have negative impacts across all target species, there is specific evidence for such impacts on certain species, particularly in relation to the targeting of specific animals with specific trophy traits and the potential for 'reverse selection'.²⁵

There is a great deal of evidence to show that trophy hunters do not target 'very old' animals, but instead covet animals in prime condition since they make the best 'trophies', which can have negative implications for conservation. Creel *et al.* (2016) noted that "*Trophy hunting has had negative effects on lion populations throughout Africa*", and that "*Hunting resulted in population declines over a 25-year period for all continuous harvest strategies, with large declines for quotas greater than 1 lion/concession (~0.5 lion/1000 km²) and hunting of males younger than 7 years*". The authors concluded that "*Age-restricted harvesting... is probably not sufficient to yield sustainability*."²⁶ The widely-used minimum age for lion trophies is 6 years.

Studies of bighorn sheep in Canada suggest that the targeting of rams with horns over a certain size may have artificially selected for reduced horn growth rates.²⁷

'Big tusker' African bull elephants have declined precipitously as a result of targeting by trophy hunters and poachers, with the loss of accumulated social knowledge and experience, as well as genes that may be hugely important to herd health.²⁸ Older bull elephants help to control younger males in bachelor groups, who may become more aggressive when the older bulls are removed, with the resulting potential for increased conflict with people.²⁹

Removing older male lions who control prides may lead to younger males killing the previous incumbent's cubs so as to be able to breed themselves, with serious implications for the cubs themselves and the adult females who care for them.³⁰

Trophy hunting may also result in parts and products derived from hunted animals being made available for international trade, which may stimulate demand and have negative consequences for individuals and populations. The increasing international trade in lion bones, identified as an emerging threat to the species³¹, has to a significant extent been fuelled by the supply of skeletal products from lions that have been killed in trophy hunts.

²⁵ Knell R.J. & Martínez-Ruiz C. 2017. Selective harvest focused on sexual signal traits can lead to extinction under directional environmental change. *Proc. Royal Soc. B.* 284 (1868).

<https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2017.1788>

²⁶ Creel *et al.* 2016. Assessing the sustainability of African lion trophy hunting, with recommendations for policy. *Ecological Applications*. doi: 10.1002/eap.1377

²⁷ Festa-Bianchet *et al.* 2014. Decrease in Horn Size and Increase in Age of Trophy Sheep in Alberta Over 37 Years. *J. Wildlife Management* 78 (1), 133-138.

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/259539814_Decrease_in_Horn_Size_and_Increase_in_Age_of_Trophy_Sheep_in_Alberta_Over_37_Years

²⁸ <http://news.nationalgeographic.com/2015/10/151017-zimbabwe-elephant-tusker-trophy-hunting-poaching-conservation-africa-ivory-trade/>

²⁹ Wang *et al.* 2000. Older bull elephants control young males. *Nature* 408: 425-426.

³⁰ Loveridge *et al.* 2016. Conservation of large predator populations: Demographic and spatial responses of African lions to the intensity of trophy hunting. *Biological Conservation* 204 (B); 247-254

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2016.10.024>

³¹ <https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/sc/70/E-SC70-54-001.pdf>

Question 7: Please provide evidence of the number of hunting trophies entering and leaving the UK, which species these are derived from and which animal parts they consist of or are made from (e.g. head, paws, skin). We are particularly interested in information about hunting trophies which do not currently require a CITES import or export permit.

In the decade from 2008 to 2017 alone, a total of almost 290,000 trophy items derived from nearly 300 different animal species listed on the CITES Appendices were exported or re-exported from 119 countries to 165 importing countries according to the CITES trade database. During this period, the UK was the declared destination for 2,242 trophy items. These included 560 derived from African elephants; 301 from hippopotamuses; 265 from American black bears; 222 from baboons; 159 from zebra; 98 from Nile crocodiles; 87 from leopards; and 80 from African lions (48 being declared as 'captive bred' and most likely derived from 'canned hunts', where the animals are killed in a confined area from which they cannot escape). During the same time period, the UK declared exports of 11 trophy items,

While the UK is not among the largest importers or exporters of hunting trophies, a UK ban would nevertheless have a significant impact by dis-incentivising potential trophy hunters from travelling overseas to kill endangered animals. It could also act as a precedent for other countries to follow, and a means of focussing the minds of decision-makers on more effective ways of devising, implementing and funding wildlife protection policies and programmes designed to benefit both wildlife and people alike.

(CITES trade statistics derived from the CITES Trade Database, UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre, Cambridge, UK. Search conducted in December 2019 for exports associated with Purpose Code 'H' (Hunting Trophy), excluding items declared by weight or volume).

Question 8: Please provide any evidence to assist our understanding of the number of companies which are supported by the movement of hunting trophies between the UK and other countries.

The fact that the UK is not among the major importers or exporters of hunting trophies suggests that the number of companies that rely wholly or partially on this trade will be relatively low.

Question 9: Would UK businesses be impacted by stricter controls on the import and export of hunting trophies and, if so, how? If possible, please provide evidence of the (i) potential magnitude of both one off and ongoing impacts, including value and/or number of sales, (ii) types of businesses (e.g. small and medium size enterprises) and (iii) distributional impacts (e.g. transfer of income between businesses and sectors).

A small number of UK businesses might be affected by stricter controls, including hunting outfitters and agents, taxidermists, shipping companies and airlines. Given the relatively low volumes of trophies imported to or exported from the UK, it seems likely that such businesses will at most be only partially reliant on trophy imports and exports for their income, and will be able to survive any restrictions by switching to other activities. Very few if any will be largely or wholly reliant on trophy imports and exports for their income.

Question 10: We are interested in finding out more about other countries' restrictions on trade, import or export of hunting trophies, or domestic restrictions on the practice of trophy hunting itself. Please provide any information and/or evidence that you are aware of on this.

Bans and restrictions on trophy hunting, and/or the import and export of trophies, have been successfully employed by a number of countries.

Kenya introduced a ban on elephant hunting in 1973, and followed this with a ban on all trophy hunting in 1977.

Zambia introduced a moratorium on lion hunting in Game Management Areas around South Luangwa National Park between 2013 and 2015.

In March 2015, Australia introduced a ban on all lion trophy imports.

In November 2015, France also introduced a ban on lion trophy imports.

In April 2016, the Netherlands introduced a ban on imports of all CITES Appendix I species and the six Appendix II species for which import permits are required under EU rules (white rhinoceros, hippopotamus, African elephant, Argali wild sheep, the African lion, and polar bear). In all, Holland has banned the import of trophies from 200 species.

Question 11: Please provide evidence of the impacts of restrictions on trade, import or export of hunting trophies, or impacts of domestic restrictions on the practice of trophy hunting on: a) species conservation and natural environment b) livelihoods and the well-being of rural communities living with wildlife c) economic development

Restrictions on trade in hunting trophies can dis-incentivise hunters from targeting animals in countries that allow trophy hunting, if they cannot bring their trophy home. Research has clearly shown that while trophy hunters may claim to be motivated by the benefits to wildlife conservation and/or local communities they claim result from their activities, in reality it is likely they are driven by certain personality traits such as narcissism, Machiavellianism and psychopathy.³² As such, the acquisition of a trophy from the animal they have killed, and their ability to utilise the trophy as a signal of financial resource and a demonstration of their prowess and skill to their peer groups, forms a vital component of their motivation.

According to Professor Judi Wakhungu, Kenya's former Cabinet Secretary of Environment, Water and Natural Resources, since the moratorium in 1977 Kenya's elephant population has been growing steadily following previous decades of decline, and the country has pursued a successful rhino breeding programme. Kenya, like many other African countries, faces serious challenges in protecting its natural resources in the face of pressure from human population growth; nevertheless, it has championed some of the most progressive conservation initiatives in Africa.

³² Beattie, G. 2019. Trophy Hunting: A Psychological Perspective. Routledge, 112 pages.
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429297984>

The UK Government needs to invest in sustainable tourism and other income generation projects with local communities (such as payments for ecosystem services, land-lease agreements, carbon offsetting etc) that help protect those areas currently used for trophy hunting concessions and make sure that they retain their current maximum conservation potential and ensure they are not lost to other uses not compatible with conservation.

Designated hunting areas often abut protected areas, so animals will move or be lured out of protected areas into hunting areas, compromising their protection, as was reportedly the case with Cecil the lion who was killed by an American trophy hunter in 2015³³. In some cases, animals are captured in National parks and other protected areas and sold to hunting concessions so they can be targeted. Restrictions on the trade in trophies may therefore help to increase security for animals within protected areas.

Strong positive population effects were noted following the moratorium on lion hunting around Zambia's South Luangwa National Park, with survival increasing by 17.1 and 14.0 percentage points in sub-adult and adult males respectively. Smaller effects on adult female survival and positive effects on cub survival were also detected.³⁴ Local communities in Zambia recently acted to prevent animals being captured from the South Luangwa National Park in order to be sold to hunting concessions, because of a lack of opportunity for them to have a say in the issue.³⁵ **Question 12: Please provide any evidence of the impact that import and export of hunting trophies to and from the UK has on supporting local livelihoods.**

Studies confirm that the total and proportion of income generated by trophy hunting that provides support for local communities or livelihoods is very low.

Trophy hunting may, in some areas, also prevent more lucrative non-consumptive forms of nature tourism from maximising their potential contribution to local economies³⁶. Because trophy hunting is a tiny part of the wider tourism sector, with little scope for sustained future growth, even a small negative effect on the wider tourism sector may undermine its economic contribution. Wildlife ecotourism is a vital income source in some areas across Africa, with recent studies showing that local communities benefit far more from live animal tourism and safaris than from trophy hunting.

There is no evidence to support the assertion that trophy hunting provides significant food for local people, nor that international trophy hunters ship the meat from their victims home for consumption.

Human-wildlife conflict is a considerable threat to many species of wild animal, particularly large species such as elephants and top predators such as big cats when they are perceived to pose a threat to crops or livestock. The presence of trophy hunting concessions does not mitigate this threat; indeed in some instances local villagers may falsely identify a 'problem animal' in order to benefit from the trophy fees that might be generated. There are numerous projects, many run by NGOs, which aim to address the complex issue of human-wildlife conflict.

³³ <https://www.nature.com/articles/nature.2015.18101>

³⁴ Mweetwa *et al.* 2018. Quantifying lion (*Panthera leo*) demographic response following a three-year moratorium on trophy hunting. Plos One. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0197030>

³⁵ <https://www.bornfree.org.uk/news/captures-zambia>

³⁶ "The effects of trophy hunting on five of Africa's iconic wild animal populations in six countries" – Conservation Act Trust, Adam Cruise, 2016

The impact that the import and export of trophies to and from the UK has on local livelihoods is therefore extremely small, and restrictions on UK trophy imports and exports may have positive benefits for local communities if it helps to stimulate the development and implementation of alternative, sustainable ways of generating income from wildlife.

Question 13: Please provide any evidence of alternative practices that could deliver similar ecological, social and economic benefits in the UK and abroad to those that trophy hunting is purported to provide.

Many sustainable and far more effective methods than trophy hunting exist for protecting and recovering wildlife populations, securing viable habitat, and benefitting local communities. Any claim that trophy hunting is the only way to ensure the maintenance of habitats for wildlife, or that it represents a significant or sustainable source of funding for wildlife or local communities, is misleading and naïve.

More effective methods include land use reforms; conservation-compatible agriculture; coexistence approaches such as through the careful development of non-destructive, low impact wildlife tourism aimed at both international and domestic markets; and innovative funding strategies such as decentralized markets made possible by blockchain technology using carbon and biodiversity credits for conserving habitats.

The recently published Global Assessment by the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) highlighted the ‘unprecedented’ decline in nature, the ‘insufficient’ global response, the need for ‘transformative changes’ to restore and protect nature, and that ‘opposition from vested interests can be overcome for the public good’.³⁷

Question 14: Please provide any evidence on the scale of revenues from trophy hunting, particularly in relation to other sectors in the economy.

In 2009 the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) estimated the annual turnover for big game hunting in Africa to be in the region of US\$200 million, around half of which is generated in South Africa, representing just 0.06% of gross domestic product for the 11 main major African countries that allow trophy hunting. This generated an average of just US\$1.1/hectare in those countries (excluding South Africa).³⁸

In its report ‘Missing the Mark’ the US Democratic staff of the House Committee on Natural Resources stated: *“Our analysis shows that trophy hunting cannot be assumed to have a conservation benefit on the strength of a guarantee that hunters’ fees will flow to communities or wildlife agencies. Additional oversight is necessary to ensure that importing trophies of ESA listed species is in fact helping those species survive in the wild.”*³⁹

³⁷ <https://www.ipbes.net/news/Media-Release-Global-Assessment>

³⁸ <https://www.iucn.org/content/big-game-hunting-west-africa-what-its-contribution-conservation>

³⁹ “Missing the Mark: African trophy hunting fails to show consistent conservation benefits”, A report by the Democratic staff of the House Committee on Natural Resources, 2016

In a 2015 report commissioned by Safari Club International entitled *“The Economic Contributions of Hunting-Related Tourism in Eastern and Southern Africa”*, it claims that trophy hunters contribute US\$426 million annually to the GDP of 8 African countries, creating 53,000 jobs, and that *“hunting provides Africa with significant economic benefits to the countries and communities who host these travellers in total and per hunter”*.⁴⁰ The report seems to equate what hunters spend with their contribution to the GDP of the African countries in the study. The amount claimed is more than double the US\$200 million total spend estimated for the whole of sub-Saharan Africa back in 2009.

The SCI report goes on to suggest that: “the estimated contribution to conservation through fees paid to landowners (private, community, and government) alone is estimated to be within the range of \$26.7 million to \$40.2 million each year.”, albeit they themselves recognise that this is ‘imprecise’. However, this only represents 6.3-9.4% of their claimed spend by trophy hunters, and given that ‘fees paid’ to private, community and government landowners won’t necessarily all go into conservation, the actual claimed financial contribution to conservation is very small.

In their analysis of the SCI report published in 2017, Economists at Large concluded that while overall tourism in the eight study countries contributed between 2.8 percent and 5.1 percent of GDP, the total economic contribution of trophy hunting was, at most, an estimated 0.03 percent of GDP. The analysis estimated that the true income from trophy hunting in the eight study countries was less than \$132 million, or just 0.78% of the estimated total annual revenue from tourism of \$17 billion, or about 0.03% of GDP. They concluded that trophy hunting has only a marginal impact on employment in the eight countries, estimated between 7,500-15,500 jobs, or less than 0.6 percent the jobs generated by tourism overall.⁴¹

In 2016, the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) talked of *“weak governance, corruption, lack of transparency, excessive quotas, illegal hunting, poor monitoring and other problems in a number of countries”*, and of the need for *“urgent action and reform”* of the industry.⁴²

According to ‘Dead or alive? Valuing an Elephant’, a live elephant may be worth as much as US\$1.6 million over its lifetime through income from photographic tourism, forty times the average fee of around US\$40,000 typically paid by a trophy hunter to shoot a bull elephant.⁴³

Question 15: How much money goes back to communities from trophy hunting compared to other activities such as wildlife tourism?

In 2009, a report for the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) estimated that, on average, big game hunting might redistribute just US\$0.1 (10 cents) per hectare of village land in Africa classified as a hunting area, and that individual community members might benefit by an average of just US\$0.30 (30 cents) each per year. The authors concluded that *“The socioeconomic contribution and the contribution to development of big game hunting is virtually nil... Such low*

⁴⁰ <https://www.southwickassociates.com/economic-contributions-of-hunting-related-tourism-in-eastern-and-southern-africa/>

⁴¹ Murray, C. K. 2017. The lion’s share? On the economic benefits of trophy hunting. A report for the Humane Society International, prepared by Economists at Large, Melbourne, Australia. <https://www.hsi.org/wp-content/uploads/assets/pdfs/economists-at-large-trophy-hunting.pdf>

⁴² https://www.iucn.org/downloads/iucn_informingdecisionsontrophyhuntingv1.pdf

⁴³ <http://iworry.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/09/Dead-or-Alive-Final-LR.pdf>

benefits do not motivate local communities. Therefore it is in their "interest" not to respect the hunting area boundaries and to poach."⁴⁴

Money from trophy hunting rarely filters down by any meaningful level. An analysis of data published by the pro-hunting International Council for Game and Wildlife Conservation and the UN Food and Agriculture Organisation, found that hunting companies contribute on average just 3% of their revenue to communities living in hunting areas; the vast majority of their income goes to government agencies, outfitters and individuals located in national capitals or overseas.⁴⁵

Economists at large described the contribution of trophy hunting as "relatively insignificant" compared to the wider tourism economy, in their 2017 report.⁴⁶

In Zambia, local community representatives have recently called for the suspension of trophy hunting operations, from which local communities do not perceive to benefit.⁴⁷

By contrast, the non-hunting wildlife tourism industry is growing much faster and has a much brighter future in Africa and beyond. A 2019 study found that global wildlife tourism directly contributed \$120.1 billion in GDP to the global economy in 2018 or 4.4% of the estimated direct global travel and tourism GDP. Wildlife tourism sustained 21.8 million jobs globally, and across Africa wildlife tourism represents over one-third of travel and tourism revenue.⁴⁸

Non-consumptive photographic wildlife tourism can operate year-round, host a very much larger number of guests, employs more people, generates higher average revenues, and offers higher staff wages than trophy hunting outfitters.⁴⁹

Question 16: Please provide any evidence to support any concerns about sub-standard welfare of animals which are hunted for trophies.

Trophy hunting has serious animal welfare implications.⁵⁰

In most circumstances where animals are deliberately killed (for example, domestic animals for food), convention demands that the methods used should minimise negative welfare impacts, and that operatives are trained and subject to oversight. However, no such requirements apply to trophy hunters.

⁴⁴ UICN/PACO (2009). La grande chasse en Afrique de l'Ouest: quelle contribution à la conservation? (Big Game Hunting in West Africa. What is its contribution to conservation?)

<https://portals.iucn.org/library/sites/library/files/documents/2009-074-En.pdf>

⁴⁵ <http://www.ecolarge.com/work/the-200-million-question-how-much-does-trophy-hunting-really-contribute-to-african-communities/>

⁴⁶ Murray, C. K. 2017. The lion's share? On the economic benefits of trophy hunting. A report for the Humane Society International, prepared by Economists at Large, Melbourne, Australia. <https://www.hsi.org/wp-content/uploads/assets/pdfs/economists-at-large-trophy-hunting.pdf>

⁴⁷ <https://www.bornfree.org.uk/news/zambia-crbs-suspension>

⁴⁸ World Travel & Tourism Council. 2019. The economic impact of global wildlife tourism.

<https://www.wttc.org/priorities/sustainable-growth/illegal-wildlife-trade/>

⁴⁹ Ian Michler, 'To Snap or Snipe?', Africa Geographic, Oct. 2, 2002.

⁵⁰ Jones and Draper 2018. Trophy Hunting and Animal Welfare. *In: Animal Welfare in a Changing World*. Edited by Andrew Butterworth. CABI. ISBN-13: 978 1 78639 245 9 HB. p 46-56.

Many trophy hunting organisations offer awards for unconventional methods of killing a trophy animal which might include the use of bows and arrows, handguns, or ‘traditional’ weapons such as muzzle loaders, methods that clearly do not prioritise the welfare of the target animal.⁵¹

Trophy hunters seek a good quality ‘trophy’, and may therefore use methods that avoid damaging specific parts of the animal that will subsequently be displayed, such as the head, increasing the chances of a slow and painful death for the target animal.

Target animals may be pursued for long periods of time (in some cases days) during hunts. Individuals may be separated from family groups or populations, which may result in considerable stress. In some cases animals may be lured out of National Parks or other protected areas in order to make them available for trophy hunts, as was reportedly the case with Cecil, the lion who was killed by an American trophy hunter outside Zimbabwe’s Hwange National Park in 2015⁵².

These factors, combined with the fact that trophy hunters are not necessarily expert shots, raise serious welfare concerns in relation to the target animal.

Trophy hunting may also have serious animal welfare implications for the animals that remain in the group or population from which the trophy animal is derived. Targeting animals with particular traits may have a disproportionate impact on the genetic and social integrity of their family group or wider population. ‘Big tusker’ bull elephants have seriously declined, with the loss of accumulated social knowledge and experience.⁵³ Older bull elephants ‘control’ younger males in bachelor groups, who may become more aggressive when the older bulls are removed, with the resulting potential for increased conflict with people.⁵⁴ Removing older male lions who control prides may lead to younger male animals killing their cubs so as to be able to breed themselves, with serious welfare impacts on the cubs themselves and the adult females who care for them.⁵⁵

⁵¹ <https://www.safariclub.org/docs/default-source/default-document-library/wha-field-journal.pdf?sfvrsn=0>

⁵² <https://www.nature.com/articles/nature.2015.18101>

⁵³ <http://news.nationalgeographic.com/2015/10/151017-zimbabwe-elephant-tusker-trophy-hunting-poaching-conservation-africa-ivory-trade/>

⁵⁴ Wang et al. 2000. Older bull elephants control young males. *Nature* 408: 425-426.

⁵⁵ Loveridge et al. 2016. Conservation of large predator populations: Demographic and spatial responses of African lions to the intensity of trophy hunting. *Biological Conservation* 204 (B); 247–254
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2016.10.024>