

Chapter 8

Hunting for Conservation?

The Re-introduction of Sport Hunting in Uganda Examined

Amos Ochieng, Wilber Manyisa Ahebwa, and Ingrid J. Visseren-Hamakers

Abstract Uganda reintroduced sport hunting in 2001. The policy was piloted around Lake Mburo National Park and later replicated around other protected areas. This chapter analyses the development, implementation and impact of sport hunting policy in Uganda. We do so through literature review, document analysis, and by analyzing the different actors' perspectives on the policy. Our analysis indicates that the sport hunting policy has undergone a dynamic development over time and is highly contested. The policy is implemented with rather varying rules across Uganda, on both public and privately-owned land. The government is of the opinion that the policy contributes to sustainable development, while other actors, such as NGOs, question the policy's impacts and ethics. The extent to which the policy is meant to contribute to conservation goals, and its impacts on conservation on-the-ground, remain unclear.

Keywords Sport hunting • Conservation • Development • Lake Mburo National Park • Uganda

A. Ochieng (✉)

Forestry, Biodiversity and Tourism Department, Makerere University, Kampala, Uganda

Wageningen University, Wageningen, The Netherlands

e-mail: amos.ochieng@wur.nl

W.M. Ahebwa

Forestry, Biodiversity and Tourism Department, Makerere University, Kampala, Uganda

e-mail: ahebwawilber@yahoo.com

I.J. Visseren-Hamakers

Forest and Nature Conservation Policy Group, Wageningen University,
Wageningen, The Netherlands

Department of Environmental Science and Policy, George Mason University,
Fairfax, VA, USA

e-mail: ingrid.visseren@wur.nl

© Springer Science+Business Media Dordrecht 2015

R. van der Duim et al. (eds.), *Institutional Arrangements for Conservation,*

Development and Tourism in Eastern and Southern Africa,

DOI 10.1007/978-94-017-9529-6_8

8.1 Sport Hunting: A Contested Practice

Sport hunting involves chasing and killing animals for pleasure (Loveridge et al. 2006). The practice started in the nineteenth century when colonial governments, traditional kings and chiefs in Africa designated areas abundant with wildlife to hunt for pleasure, show of prowess and attain trophies (Ayorekire et al. 2011). Currently, sport hunting in Africa mainly involves tourists paying to hunt, with some of the proceeds flowing to communities (Lindsey et al. 2006, 2007).

Proponents consider sport hunting as a market-based conservation and development approach, and argue that it is one of the ways through which wildlife can be used to provide economic incentives to rural communities and subsequently bridge the conservation-development divide. McAfee (1999: 134), for example, points out that “nature, if offered an opportunity, can earn its own right to survive in the world market economy”. She therefore argues for commercialization of nature and the granting of concessions to rent-seekers to manage nature on behalf of, or sometimes with, governments. The income could then provide incentives for conservation and development, potentially empowering formerly excluded residents. This would require that individuals invest in sport hunting and selling game products (Fischer et al. 2013), and that hunting would be controlled, e.g. through a limited number of off-take per year (Baker 1997; Hurt and Ravn 2000).

Critics, however, argue that this market-based approach advances neoliberal ideologies, i.e. linking nature to capital, thereby disenfranchising local residents and national governments, and weakens social relations and environmental outcomes (Büscher et al. 2012; Fletcher 2010). They also argue that sport hunting hampers animal regeneration as it interferes with animal grazing patterns and mating seasons. Others raise ethical concerns. Loveridge et al. (2006), for example, are critical of killing wild animals just for hunters’ entertainment. It is argued that the form of stress, distress and death caused by hunting, can cause damage to and extinction of wildlife (Gamborg et al. 2012; Fischer et al. 2013), and violates the moral principle of the sanctity of life. In their study on the morality of hunting in Europe and eastern Africa, Fischer et al. (2013) reveal that hunting is only generally accepted if it is done for subsistence. Otherwise, commercial hunting is seen as an act of taking away life, which should be prohibited. These critics thus question whether sport hunting indeed enhances effective conservation and development, and critique the idea of killing wildlife for conservation and development purposes.

In the early twentieth century, the colonial administrators in Uganda, together with reigning kings and chiefs, declared areas abundant in wildlife so-called ‘Controlled Hunting Areas’ (CHAs) (Ochieng 2011). With this, the creation of CHAs marked the beginning of hunting as a sport in the country. CHAs were created to minimize impact by local inhabitants on wildlife populations, and to provide grounds for colonial governments, traditional kings and chiefs to, among others, hunt for pleasure and attain trophies for rituals (Ayorekire et al. 2011). In Uganda, CHAs were gazetted in the 1920s, as legitimized by the 1926 Game Ordinance that cemented the central government’s control over CHAs (Lamprey and Mugisha 2009).

The Game Ordinance thereby provided for the creation of many CHAs across the country, including the Ankole controlled hunting area (today's Lake Mburo National Park – LMNP), Semeliki controlled hunting area (today's Semeliki Wildlife Reserve), and Karamoja hunting areas (areas around Kidepo Valley NP). It is this type of hunting that dates back to the colonial era that we refer to as the 'old' sport hunting. This 'old' sport hunting was conducted only in government-controlled reserves, and it mainly targeted big game, such as rhinos and elephants, that were thought to fetch large sums of money for the government. The local communities neither participated in the design of its guiding principles nor directly shared in the accrued benefits (Ochieng 2011).

As such, the 'old' sport hunting model fueled persistent human-wildlife conflicts and resistance in Uganda. Local residents continually encroached on hunting grounds, and illegally hunted small game, like deer and duikers, for subsistence use. They also burned and cleared forested areas for cultivation, and poisoned and killed wildlife, especially on land privately owned by the communities, since the animals caused damage to crops, competed for pasture and water, and spread diseases (Ayorekire et al. 2011).

This 'old' hunting in Uganda, combined with the illegal hunting and the national political unrest throughout the 1970s, greatly affected wildlife populations, with some species, such as the white rhinoceros and lion, becoming extinct in some ecosystems (Kamugisha et al. 1997). This led to a ministerial decree that banned all forms of hunting in Uganda in 1979 to allow for wildlife regeneration (Ayorekire et al. 2011).

Since then, the increase in the human population has resulted in increasing demand for land for settlement and agriculture. This implies that today, wildlife faces greater risk of extinction than ever before. Moreover, wildlife does not recognize the boundaries of the remaining 'islands' of conservation areas and spends most of the time grazing and roaming on privately owned community land (Ayorekire et al. 2011). According to estimates by the Uganda Wildlife Authority (UWA), over 65 % of wildlife lives and/or feeds outside protected areas (UWA official, Research Interview 2013). This exposes them to the risk of illegal hunting, and intensifies human-wildlife conflicts. In order to address these issues, the government extended conservation efforts outside protected areas (PAs), which led to the enactment of the Wildlife User Rights (WURs) by UWA in 2000 (Ayorekire et al. 2011). One of the key elements of these WURs is the reintroduction of sport hunting, here referred to as the 'new' sport hunting.

The introduction of the 'new' sport hunting started as a pilot project in 2001 around LMNP (UWA 2005). It was meant to address the conservation and development challenges in the area. The government, through UWA, reintroduced sport hunting, with the financial, technical, and supervisory support from NGOs (Former UWA official, Research Interview 2013). UWA also worked in cooperation with local governments (LGs), the Community Wildlife Associations (CWAs), and Community Protected Areas Institutions (CPIs).

This chapter examines the development and implementation of the 'new' sport hunting. To achieve this, the chapter answers the following research questions: (1) How was sport hunting reintroduced and how has it been implemented; and

(2) What are the impacts of the policy? The first question will be answered by analyzing the development of the policy, the policy framework, the actors involved, and the revenue-sharing arrangements. For the second question we will review existing evaluations of the policy, and present the views of the different stakeholders on the policy's impacts.

The analysis draws on views expressed in policy documents, and views of policy makers and stakeholders on its implementation and impacts. The chapter is based on interviews that were conducted with sport hunting policy stakeholders at the national level in Uganda between June-October 2013. A total of 15 in-depth interviews plus over 15 informal conversations were held with different actors, including officials from government agencies, including UWA and the Ministry of Tourism, Wildlife and Heritage; NGOs, such as World Wildlife Fund (WWF), African Wildlife Foundation (AWF), International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), Fauna and Flora International (FFI) and Nature Uganda (NU); and sport hunting companies and tourism associations, including Uganda Tourism Association (UTA), Association of Uganda Tour Operators (AUTO) and Uganda Safari Guides Association (USAGA). These interviews were supplemented by an extensive review of secondary data, such as policy documents, evaluation reports, newspaper articles, and (un)published (academic) articles and reports.

The chapter is organized as follows. Section 8.2 answers the two research questions by presenting the development and implementation of the 'new' sport hunting. The last section discusses our results and makes some final conclusions.

8.2 The Development and Implementation of the 'New' Sport Hunting

In this section, we discuss and explain the development and implementation of the 'new' sport hunting at the national level, with illustrative examples from LMNP.

Table 8.1 shows that the 'new' sport hunting has developed through different phases. It was first introduced in Rurambiira parish in 2001 as a pilot, with some policy makers, such as UWA, CPI and the local government being positive about the results. The pilot was then replicated to more parishes around LMNP, such as Nyakahita and Rwakanombe parishes between 2003 and 2005 (UWA 2005), when the company Game Trails Uganda Limited (GTL) was granted a hunting concession and quota for the three parishes. In 2008, UWA commissioned an independent external evaluation. The policy evaluation outcomes were positive in terms of social impacts: the communities received direct revenue and benefitted from infrastructural development such as roads, dams, schools and health centers (see Muhimbura and Namara 2009). This motivated UWA to replicate it to other protected areas between 2008 and 2012. Currently, five hunting companies are licensed across Uganda (see Table 8.5), with different hunting concessions and hunting quotas (see Tables 8.3 and 8.4). Also, different types of actors are involved in the various regions, causing different typologies of the local arrangements.

Table 8.1 Phases in the development and implementation of sport hunting in Uganda

	Period				
		2001	2002	2003–2007	2008–2012
Levels	National	Policy documents developed	1st evaluation	Implementation and coordination of the different policy documents	External evaluation around LMNP (2008), decision to replicate sport hunting across Uganda, drafting of national sport hunting policy
	Local	Pilot sport hunting in Rurambiira parish (LMNP)	Continued implementation in Rurambiira	Implementation in new parishes, including Nyahahita and Rwakanombe; new hunting agreements; changes in revenue percentages; and new actors emerging, e.g. landowners	Implementation in new areas around Uganda; different revenue sharing agreements; new hunting quotas, hunting agreements, more actors, resources, and hunting companies licensed and hunting fees revised

8.2.1 *The Sport Hunting Typologies in the Different Locations*

The ‘new’ sport hunting is being implemented in different locations under diverse circumstances (see Table 8.2). While around some protected areas (e.g. Kafu river basin ranches, Nakaseke, Masindi, Kiboga districts) it is practiced purely on privately-owned land, in other cases it is practiced on both private land and government-owned reserves (e.g. around LMNP). In other areas, it is practiced only in government reserves (e.g. Kabwoya Wildlife Reserve) and community-owned wildlife areas (e.g. Kaiso-Tonya Community Wildlife Area). Overall, the ‘new’ sport hunting is managed by both governmental and non-governmental actors, who jointly formulate its guiding principles, stipulated in the sport hunting agreements. These principles include, for example, rules regarding which animals to hunt, e.g. only mature males, penalties for (accidentally) injuring an animal unintended for hunting, and monitoring of hunting.

8.2.2 *The Policy Framework*

The implementation of the ‘new’ sport hunting was guided by the Uganda Wildlife Policy (MTTI 1999: 12), that states “...government will encourage a range of participatory approaches such as empowering the people to participate in the conservation and management of the country’s natural resources...”. Also, the Community

Table 8.2 Typologies and examples of sport hunting areas in Uganda

Typology	Examples
Community-owned wildlife areas	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Karenga CWA – adjacent to Kidepo Valley National Park 2. Amudat CWA – an extensive arid area in eastern Karamoja, and a buffer zone between the Pia, Karimojong and the Pokot communities 3. Irii CWA – Bokora Corridor wildlife reserve (WR) 4. Rwengara CWA – on the southern shores of Lake Albert and part of the wildlife corridor between the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) and Toro Semliki WR
Privately-owned lands	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ranches in Kafu River basin – i.e. the southern ‘cattle corridor’ of the central rangelands of Luwero, Nakasongola, Nakaseke, Kiboga and Masindi Districts, and the private ranches around LMNP 2. Ranches in Aswa-Lolim – found in the open rangelands north of Murchison Falls NP, e.g. degazetted Aswa-Lolim Game Reserve and Kilak CHA, in Gulu and Amuru Districts 3. Ssesse Islands – the Ssesse Islands comprise a cluster of some 35 islands in Lake Victoria, most of which are part of forest reserves 4. Ngenge plains in Kapchorwa – This lies south of Karamoja, formerly Sebei CHA
Government-owned wildlife reserves	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Pian-Upe wildlife reserve in Karamoja 2. Bokora-Matheniko wildlife reserve in Karamoja 3. Ajai wildlife reserve in Arua 4. Ngenge plains in Kapchorwa 5. Ssesse Islands (wildlife reserves) 6. Rwengara CWA

Conservation Policy (UWA 2004: 6) echoes UWA’s mission statement in this regard: “...to conserve and sustainably manage wildlife and protected areas in Uganda in partnership with the neighboring communities and stakeholders for the benefit of the people of Uganda and the global community”. These documents recognize that a vast number of wild animals is found outside protected areas and must be protected.

Section 29 of the Uganda Wildlife Act 2000 (Cap. 200) provides for six Wildlife User Right (WUR) classes for the general public to benefit from wildlife. These include: sport hunting, farming, ranching, trade, research and education, and resource access. The WUR classification was meant to combat illegal hunting, as changing land uses and degradation of wildlife habitats had raised a lot of concern, especially about ensuring the survival of wildlife outside PAs. At this time, the attitude of communities towards wildlife was not conducive for conservation, leading to drastic decline of wildlife (UWA undated). Local residents saw wildlife as useless and destructive (UWA undated), and according to UWA this attitude encouraged illegal hunting.

Hence, the WUR classification was envisaged as an incentive to promote wildlife conservation and combat the negative perceptions of communities, who regarded wildlife as government property and of benefit only to foreign tourists (UWA undated). The policy was guided by the overall objective of promoting sustainable

Table 8.3 The 2012 provisional quota allocation for the LMNP area (UWA 2012a)

No	Scientific name	Common name	Quota	Animal fees (USD)	Remarks
1	<i>Aepyceros melampus</i>	Impala	80	350	
2	<i>Damaliscus lunatus</i>	Topi	10	700	
3	<i>Equus burchelli boehmi</i>	Zebra	100	500	
4	<i>Hippopotamus amphibius</i>	Hippos	5	600	Only 'problem animals'
5	<i>Kobus ellipsiprymus defassa</i>	Waterbuck	20	800	
6	<i>Ourebi ourebi</i>	Oribi	5	300	
7	<i>Panthera pardus</i>	Leopard	4	5,000	Only 'problem animals'
8	<i>Papio anubis</i>	Baboon	20	20	Vermin ^a
9	<i>Phacochoerus aethiopicus</i>	Warthog	20	350	
10	<i>Potamochoerus porcus</i>	Bushpig	30	150	Vermin
11	<i>Redunca redunca</i>	Bohor Reedbuck	10	400	
12	<i>Sylvicapra gramma</i>	Duiker	10	200	
13	<i>Syncerus caffer</i>	Buffalo	30	1,500	
14	<i>Tragelaphus oryx</i>	Eland	10	1,500	
15	<i>Tragelaphus scriptus</i>	Bushbuck	25	600	
16	<i>Tragelaphus spekii</i>	Sitatunga	2	2,000	
17	<i>Crocuta crocuta</i>	Hyena	2	300	Only 'problem animals'

^aPests or nuisance animals, especially those that are viewed to threaten human society by spreading diseases or destroying crops and livestock

Table 8.4 The 2012 provisional quota allocation for Kabwoya wildlife reserve and Kaiso-Tonya community wildlife area (UWA 2012a)

No	Scientific name	Common name	Quota	Animal fees (USD)	Remarks
1	<i>Kobus kob</i>	Uganda Kob	25	450	
2	<i>Ourebia ourebia</i>	Oribi	15	300	
3	<i>Papioa nubis</i>	Baboon	15	20	Vermin
4	<i>Phacochoerus aethiopicus</i>	Warthog	10	350	
5	<i>Potamochoerus porcus</i>	Bushpig	15	150	Vermin
6	<i>Sylvicapra gramma</i>	Duiker	15	200	
7	<i>Syncerus caffer</i>	Buffalo	2	1,500	
8	<i>Tragelaphus scriptus</i>	Bushbuck	15	600	

extractive wildlife utilization, by facilitating the involvement of landowners and users in managing wildlife outside PAs, through the provision of incentives from wildlife.

Further, several national policies, including the Uganda Land Act Cap 227 1998, the National Environment Act 1995, the National Forestry and Tree Planting Act 2003, the National Environment Management Policy 1994, the Environmental

Table 8.5 Sport hunting companies in Uganda (UWA 2012b)

Number	Sport hunting companies	Operational areas
1	Game Trails (U) Ltd. (GTL)	Ranches outside Lake Mburo National Park (Kiruhura District), Katonga wildlife reserve
2	Lake Albert Safaris Ltd.	Kalangala District, Kabwoya and East Madi wildlife reserves, and Kaiso-Tonya community wildlife area
3	Karamoja Safaris Ltd.	Bokora-Matheniko wildlife reserve, Karenga and Iriri community wildlife area
4	Uganda wildlife Safaris Ltd.	Ajai wildlife reserve and Luwero, Nakaseke, Nakasongola, and Amuru Districts
5	Karamojong Overlander Safaris Ltd.	Pian-Upe wildlife reserve and Amudati community wildlife area

Impact Assessment Regulations 1998, the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan 2000, and the National Development Plan 2015, vest all rights of ownership of wildlife with the government of Uganda. They grant limited provisions for individuals to own wildlife, upon lawful acquisition, and share benefits that may accrue from it for social development. Furthermore, the Uganda Wildlife Statute 1995; 1999 and 2004 and Uganda Wildlife Act 1996 stipulate which wildlife can be hunted, and include rules that guide the allocation of hunting quota and hunting blocks, i.e. “any area of land...demarcated as a block managed by an association for professional ... hunting” (UWA 2001: 1). At the local level, the new sport hunting is guided by the Local Government Act 1997, the CPI Policy 2000, the CWAs constitutions, and the community norms, which vary from community to community. The local government authorities and CWAs are meant to work hand in hand with UWA to monitor the utilization of annual hunting quotas in the different areas. Tables 8.3 and 8.4 show different annual hunting quotas and fees around LMNP and KWR. These quotas are allocated based on the number of species in a PA. The animal fee means the amount to be paid per animal killed.

8.2.3 Actors Involved in the ‘New’ Sport Hunting

Several different types of actors are involved in the ‘new’ sport hunting arrangement, either as policy developer, implementer or beneficiary, while others are only consulted. These different manners in which various actors are involved results in very diverse understandings of the policy, and different presentations of the rationale behind it.

The key actor controlling and implementing the policy is UWA, which introduced the ‘new’ sport hunting, meant as a tool to bridge the conservation-development divide in and around PAs. This was guided by the market-based discourse of ‘selling nature to save it’ (McAfee 1999). UWA advanced sport hunting as an instrument that could minimise illegal hunting outside PAs, provide an

incentive for local communities to control their off-take of wildlife, and promote rational use and conservation of wildlife. In the process, UWA involved civil society, the private sector, local communities and donors.

Currently, USAID, WWF and GTZ are in the process of informing communities about the potential benefits of sport hunting, through financing workshops and familiarization tours to southern and other eastern African countries, to learn from their experiences (UWA official, Interview 2013). These organisations are also working on sensitizing the local communities on the values of wildlife, aimed at making communities appreciate wildlife as ‘assets’ that can lead to development, and not as a ‘burden’ to them, since they currently receive direct benefits, and are being ‘freed of’ ‘problem animals’¹ (e.g. baboons). “... NGOs like WCS, AWF and USAID are supporting communities by building the associations’ capacity to manage resources around them” (UWA official, Research Interview 2013). Communities are also undergoing training in business management, bookkeeping, and monitoring and supervision of sport hunting projects (see Ochieng 2011).

UWA and the local communities, especially the beneficiaries from the parishes around LMNP, claim that development can be realized through the ‘new’ sport hunting, by referring to schools, health centers, roads, and animal watering points that have been constructed for the communities (Ayorekire et al. 2011). The Ministry of Tourism Wildlife and Heritage also asserts that animal populations have increased and local communities’ attitudes towards wildlife have improved (MTWH official, Interview 2013). According to UWA, this is because certain conditions were met before sport hunting was introduced, including sufficient numbers of animals to hunt, support by communities and the local government, capable private partners, and signed agreements between the parties involved (UWA official, Interview 2013).

The sport hunting companies are also of the opinion that sport hunting could be used for conservation and development, with one interviewee stating that “...if sport hunting worked well among the southern African countries, then it should work for Uganda” (GTL official, Interview 2013). Since the initiation and rolling out of sport hunting across Uganda in 2008, UWA has licensed five professional companies.

The company Game Trails Uganda Limited (GTL) was first licenced for hunting around LMNP in 2001 by UWA, based on the provisions of the Uganda Wildlife Act 2000. The licence has been renewed on an annual basis. All companies are working closely with different types of stakeholders to implement sport hunting in the different areas in Uganda (see Table 8.6).

The number and relevance of the different stakeholders across Uganda have changed over time. In the beginning, mainly UWA, CWAs, LG, CPI and GTL were involved (see Ochieng 2011). Currently, landowners, CWAs and UWA are the most relevant stakeholders around LMNP, with CPI and LG losing their relevance.

¹Any protected animals that cause or may cause material damage to any land, crop, domestic animal, building, equipment or other property (UWA 2004).

Table 8.6 Actors involved in sport hunting

Actor	Responsibilities and activities
UWA	Grant use-rights and licenses to professional hunting companies
	Monitor the hunting activities and advise companies
	Determine the animal and area booking fees in consultation with the hunting company and the CWA
	Conduct wildlife management training for CWA members together with the hunting company
	Control illegal hunting in the project area
	Build capacity among stakeholders to monitor and evaluate project operations
Local government (Local Councils and Sub-County Administration)	Facilitate registration and legalization of CWAs
	Provide guidance and support to the project to ensure sustainable utilization of wildlife
	Assist in policing and monitoring illegal activities in the project area
Community Wildlife Associations (CWAs)	Ensure protection of wildlife within the hunting blocks against illegal hunting through participating in policing and monitoring of project activities
	Report instances of poaching, ensure land use practices are consistent with promotion of wildlife conservation
	Secure protection of sport hunters and employees of professional hunting companies while within their hunting block
	Work together with local authorities, keep proper books and accounts and granting UWA access thereto
	Provide information to the hunting company and UWA on the status and distribution of wildlife within the hunting blocks
Community Protected Area Institutions (CPIs)	Ensure project activities are integrated into local government development plans
	Facilitate dialogue and conflict resolution
	Represent local community interests and concerns with regard to wildlife conservation
	Mobilize local people to support project implementation
Sport hunting companies	Carry out professional hunting in the project area
	Record hunting activities on daily basis and submit the data to UWA for quarterly analysis
	Provide quarterly operational reports, enforce wildlife laws among clients and ensure personnel abides by the law
	Ensure that animals wounded by clients are humanely handled and accounted for
	Maintain appropriate camping facilities for clients in the hunting blocks, where necessary
Conservation NGOs and Tourism Associations	Advocate for the rights of the communities and the animals
	Fund local conservation and development projects
	Monitor sport hunting impacts on the communities
	Provide technical guidance
	Advise UWA, CWAs and local communities on the implementation of conservation and development projects
	Organise discussion fora
	Campaign against sport hunting activities in Uganda

8.2.4 *The Sport Hunting Fees and Revenue Sharing*

Table 8.7 shows the animal fees over time. The fact that these have been adjusted since 2001 is an indication of the changes during the policy's implementation and the value that hunters attach to different species. For example, species like buffalos, leopards, elands and sitatungas attracted a higher market value in the last 4 years. This is explained by the fact that they are threatened, although hunting is allowed on condition that it is a 'problem animal' (UWA official, Interview 2013). Charging high rates is thus meant to prevent a high off-take. Species like baboons, bushpigs, oribis, and warthogs maintained or declined in market value. Interviews with UWA officials and document review revealed that the animal fee for baboons was reduced to USD 20 from USD 90, because other countries in the region allow hunting of baboons without charge. Moreover, baboons are considered vermins that need to be controlled. New species have also been included on the animal fee list since 2012. This could be explained by the increased number of hunting blocks, hunting companies and diverse hunters' interests. In this case, UWA has adjusted the fees to match the market demand.

Table 8.7 Animal fees (UWA 2012a)

No	Animal fees in USD					
	Animal	2001	2006	2008	2010	2012
1	Baboon	90	90	90	90	20
2	Buffalo	600	650	900	900	1,500
3	Bushbuck	250	300	500	500	600
4	Bushpig	150	150	150	150	150
5	Duiker	130	150	200	200	200
6	Eland	600	650	800	800	1,000
7	Hippo	500	500	600	600	600
8	Impala	250	300	350	350	350
9	Leopard	–	–	3,500	5,000	5,000
10	Oribi	150	150	300	300	300
11	Reedbuck	250	300	400	400	400
12	Topi	350	400	650	650	650
13	Warthog	250	300	350	350	350
14	Waterbuck	500	550	600	600	1,000
15	Zebra	500	500	550	550	550
16	Sitatunga	–	–	–	1,500	2,000
17	Crocodile	–	–	–	–	1,000
18	Dik-Dik	–	–	–	–	200
29	Hartebeest	–	–	–	–	1,000
20	Hyena	–	–	–	–	100
21	Jackal	–	–	–	–	200
22	Klipspringer	–	–	–	–	700
23	Red Hartebeest	–	–	–	–	1,000
24	Uganda Kob	–	–	–	–	450

Table 8.8 Revenue sharing percentages around LMNP (UWA 2012a)

Stakeholder	Percentage (%) share of animal fee			
	2001	2003	2008	2012
CWAs	65	65	45	40
UWA	25	15	15	10
Land Owner	0	10	30	50
CPI	5	5	5	0
Local Government (Sub-county)	5	5	5	0

Among the different species around LMNP, buffalo was the most hunted animal between 2001 and 2007, with a total of 85 animals hunted out of 85 animals that were on the quota. This was followed by waterbuck with 65 out of 83 animals hunted, and bushbuck with 66 out of 72 animals hunted. This implies that buffalo was the only animal with 100 % quota utilization between 2001 and 2007 (Muhimbura and Namara 2009). This is because hunters prefer savannah buffalo to cape buffalo (UWA official, Research Interview 2013).

Table 8.8 shows that over the years the revenue sharing arrangement around LMNP has been revised three times. With this, sport hunting revenue distribution among stakeholders has been dynamic, with landowners earning more and CWAs around LMNP earning less over time. Previously, landowners were also excluded from direct benefit-sharing schemes, on the assumption that they would benefit through their CWAs. Due to this arrangement, landowners have advocated for transfer of all animals into the park and fencing of the park, and have continuously encouraged illegal hunting on private land. However, landowners have now been included in the revenue arrangement, since benefits that accrue through the CWAs are spent in communal projects (Ayorekire et al. 2011) and enjoyed by everyone, and yet, when animals damage crops in individual farms, the landowner solely bears the burden. To ‘compensate’ landowners around LMNP, it was agreed that a landowner, on whose farm an animal is killed, receives a direct share of 50 % of the particular animal fee, and also indirectly benefits from the 40 % that goes to the CWAs. UWA retains the 10 % for administrative costs. “In addition to what the landowner receives, the landowner is also entitled to benefit from the general community fund. The community fund is used for the community projects like roads, bridges, water points etc.” (UWA official, Research Interview 2013). The current arrangement is thus meant to make landowners better appreciate the value of animals on their land. As a result, landowners now play a central role in the arrangement.

Sport hunting around LMNP generated a total of USD 323,086 from the animal fees and other fees between 2001 and 2007, which was shared among stakeholders as follows: CWAs USD 199,170; UWA USD 68,110; landowners USD 26,566; CPI USD 14,120; and sub-counties USD 14,120 (Muhimbura and Namara 2009).

However, local governments and CPIs around LMNP, which no longer receive revenue from animal fees, receive a daily community development fee of USD 20 and USD 20, respectively, which is paid by sport hunters and observers² (UWA 2012).

²An observer is a person(s) who travel(s) with a sport hunter to observe the hunting.

Table 8.9 Fees payable for community development and conservation around LMNP (UWA 2012a)

	Type of fee paid by different actors	Rate (USD)
1	Community development fee – hunter (per day)	20
2	Community development fee – observer (per day)	20
3	Conservation fee – hunter (per day)	200
4	Conservation fee – observer (per day)	200
5	Animal fee (hunter)	See Table 8.7
6	Hunting permit – hunting company (per year)	600
7	Trophy handling – hunter (per animal)	300
8	Daily fees (hunter)	Various
9	Anti-poaching fees – hunter (per animal)	20 % of animal fees

This money is payable around all PAs where hunting is taking place. The money is shared by LG and CPIs as 35 % and 65 % respectively (UWA 2012), and is supposed to be invested in community infrastructure, implying that the community development fee flows back to community institutions. Furthermore, the hunter and observer each pay a daily conservation fee of USD 200 to the CWA revenue pool. This money is meant solely for CWAs activities (Table 8.9).

8.2.5 Impact of the ‘New’ Sport Hunting

In piloting the ‘new’ sport hunting, UWA developed the following objectives: to reduce human-wildlife conflicts, to provide incentives for local inhabitants to manage and protect wildlife, to positively change residents’ attitudes towards conservation, and to provide lessons in developing guidelines and procedures for its further implementation (Lamprey et al. 2003). These policy objectives are mainly oriented towards local communities, and only indirectly target conservation goals.

Since 2001, UWA has commissioned two evaluations to assess the impact of the ‘new’ sport hunting, which were both overseen by UWA, MTWH and CWAs executives. First, UWA conducted an internal evaluation in 2002, after the first pilot, to establish community response to the project, and how the revenue was being used. UWA again commissioned an external evaluation in 2008 (see Muhimbura and Namara 2009) to assess ecological and social impacts of the project, establish community attitudes towards wildlife, and assess impacts of the project and recommend remedies. The evaluators mainly interviewed officials from UWA, MTWH, GTL, CPI and local government, association executives and project beneficiaries around LMNP. It therefore largely ignored the views of ‘other’ community members, especially those that were considered non-landowners or immigrants.

In the evaluations, the ‘new’ sport hunting around LMNP is reported to have registered some positive impacts in terms of community development. Both evaluations (UWA undated; UWA 2011; Muhimbura and Namara 2009), indicate that communities received direct revenue and benefitted from infrastructural development such as roads, dams, schools, and health centers. UWA also claims that the number of wild animals outside PAs has increased over the years (UWA undated).

Our interviews show an extremely varied evaluation of the ‘new’ sport hunting among the different actors involved. According to UWA, MTWH, CPI and local government officials, this policy has been vital in changing community attitudes towards wildlife (Former MTWH official, Research Interview 2013). Also the built schools provide formal education to their children, making them appreciate the value of wildlife (Ochieng 2011).

However, these ‘success stories’ are not shared by all actors. Nationally, and in other regions, stakeholders critique the policy and its impacts, and different actors have joined and formed, often opposing, coalitions. Some NGOs, such as NU, and trade associations, such as UTA, AUTO and USAGA, and regional bodies like Wildlife-Direct argue that Uganda does not have enough wildlife to sustain the practice (USAGA official, Research Interview 2013). These organisations do not support sport hunting for conservation and development, they believe in the protectionist model of conservation, in which nature is preserved for its intrinsic value. NU, Wildlife Direct (WD) and USAGA also argue that “... sport hunting will lead to a drastic decline in wildlife populations... there is no sufficient data on wildlife populations across Uganda to support it (USAGA official, Research Interview 2013). Others, such as IFAW, critique the gruesome nature of killing wildlife under the pretext of sport hunting. They also accuse UWA of manipulating figures to portray that wildlife populations have increased (NU official, Research Interview 2013). “Someone was giving a fake figure that we have many leopards in Uganda... we don’t see them during non-hunting game drives, you spend 3, 4, 5 days without seeing any leopard, and now you start hunting them...they are not enough” (UTA official, Research Interview 2013). These practices seem to contradict the CCP which advocates for “applying scientific criteria to wildlife utilisation” especially where there are “rare, high risk and endangered species” (UWA 2004:11). Also, some communities around LMNP criticize UWA for assuming that increasing animal populations outside PAs is a result of sport hunting (NU official, Interview 2013). To them, more animals could be moving out of the park in search for pasture due to competition with cattle from ‘illegal grazers’, and maybe prey animals are fleeing from predators. Others, like FFI, are also pessimistic about sport hunting, and are especially concerned that the implementers seem to be diverting from its original objective of bridging the conservation-development gap. “[S]port hunting could be a good tool to achieve conservation objectives, ..., if very well managed... Things are changing on the ground, people are no longer interested and they want to get rid of wild animals... I am not sure that sport hunting has a future...” (FFI official, Interview 2013).

However, UTA and some representatives of local communities are of the opinion that sport hunting can lead to development. “... sport hunting can lead to sustainable

development when it is proven that wildlife populations are beyond sustainable levels ... and if game ranching³ is first introduced” (UTA official, Interview 2013). They think that once communities are in full charge of the animals, they will be able to determine how much a hunter can pay them, and monitor off-take, unlike in the present arrangement, where UWA sets the quotas and price, and monitors hunting.

Further, NGOs, like WWF and AWF, also believe that sport hunting could lead to community development only if it is well managed. They argue that UWA sets the quotas and prices for the different animal species, without directly involving the local communities, who are supposed to monitor and ensure constant flow of direct benefits from the program. This raises questions in terms of transparency and accountability. The communities do not know how many animals are actually hunted in a season, as some information, which is regarded as ‘classified information’, is kept at management levels, leaving the communities to wait for whatever revenue is shared with them.

The current sport hunting arrangements also encounter other operational challenges. For example, Ochieng (2011) reports accusations and counter accusations among community members, association executives, and between UWA and community members. For instance, association executives and community members accuse GTL of frequently hunting on government ranches and land of influential individuals, and leaving animals to destroy crops, especially of less influential local residents. This is noted to be common in cases where a hunting agreement is meant for both private and government land, e.g. around LMNP. Further, the communities also claim that the distribution of project revenue is inequitable, and only benefited the sport hunting companies and UWA (Muhimbura and Namara 2009). This potentially creates disparities in the amount of revenue that flows to CWAs and landowners.

To date, it is not clear to what extent the policy has achieved its goals. Whereas policy makers like UWA and MTWH see it as leading to positive changes, communities and non-governmental actors largely remain skeptical. Our research thus shows that the impact of this policy is contested. Moreover, there also seem to be differences between the policy on paper and policy on ground. UWA, together with MTWH, allocates and approves annual quotas, and in some cases allocates additional hunting quota to the hunting companies, which are not usually formally approved. There has also been a delay in the review process of the hunting license for GTL around LMNP, and the company has continued to hunt, by having its clients cleared on a day-by-day basis for over a year (as of October 2013). This makes monitoring the company’s activities highly problematic, especially in the absence of a legally binding contract.

Finally, the policy guiding the ‘new’ sport hunting is still considered a draft regulation (a so-called ‘Draft zero’⁴). Furthermore, the five hunting companies in Uganda are operating under different agreements, making a generalization of the impact of the policy at the national level difficult to determine.

³ Granting local communities permission to own and rear wildlife on their land.

⁴ Proposal has been developed by a civil servant, awaiting to be discussed and approved by the responsible minister.

8.3 Discussion and Conclusion

Uganda reintroduced sport hunting as a national policy for conservation and development. The sport hunting policy in Uganda changed over time. The policy was first introduced as a pilot project around LMNP in 2001, and has been replicated to new areas. The policy framework has changed over time to meet the interests of various stakeholders in the arrangement. Thereby, the policy is now guided by rather varying rules across Uganda, including new agreements signed regarding benefit sharing, and varying hunting quotas developed for different areas. This has created different forms of sport hunting across the country, with variable interpretations of the objectives and impact of the policy.

The implementation of the policy has attracted a myriad of stakeholders, who perform various roles in the implementation. Nonetheless, on many occasions, landowners have claimed a more central position in steering the ‘new’ sport hunting. This is, among others, reflected by the inclusion of landowners among beneficiaries of sport hunting. However, UWA still maintains a central position by setting hunting quotas, fees, carrying out animal census, registering and issuing hunting licences and guidelines, and monitoring the operations of hunting companies and CWAs. UWA is also mandated by the Uganda Wildlife Act 2000 to conserve and manage all wildlife for the benefit of the communities.

The impact of the ‘new’ sport hunting policy is highly contested. Whereas the government is convinced that sport hunting is an appropriate instrument for sustainable development, other stakeholders, including UTA, USAGA, AUTO, NU and Wildlife Direct, challenge the manner in which sport hunting is being practiced. However, they do not have enough influence to change current sport hunting practices. The contribution of sport hunting to conservation especially remains highly contested. Moreover, the more fundamental ethical questions of applying hunting for conservation have to date hardly been discussed in Uganda.

References

- Ayorekire, J., Ahebwa, M. W., & Ochieng, A. (2011). Managing conservation and development on private land: An assessment of the sport hunting approach around Lake Mburo National Park, Uganda. In V. R. Van der Duim, D. Meyer, J. Saarinen, & K. Zellmer (Eds.), *New alliances for tourism, conservation and development in eastern and southern Africa* (pp. 185–207). Delft: Eburon.
- Baker, J. E. (1997). Trophy hunting as a sustainable use of wildlife resources in southern and eastern Africa. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 5(4), 306–321.
- Büscher, B., Sullivan, S., Neves, K., Igoe, J., & Brockington, D. (2012). Towards a synthesized critique of neoliberal biodiversity conservation. *Capitalism Nature Socialism*, 23(2), 4–30.
- Fischer, A., Keržič, V., Arroyo, B., Mateos-Delibes, M., Tadie, D., Lowassa, A., Krange, O., & Skogen, K. (2013). (De-)legitimising hunting – Discourses over the morality of hunting in Europe and eastern Africa. *Land Use Policy*, 32, 261–270.
- Fletcher, R. (2010). Neoliberal environmentalism: Towards a poststructuralist political ecology of the conservation debate. *Conservation and Society*, 8(3), 171–181.

- Gamborg, C., Palmer, C., & Sandoe, P. (2012). Ethics of wildlife management and conservation: What should we try to protect? *Nature Education Knowledge*, 3(10), 8.
- Hurt, R., & Ravn, P. (2000). Hunting and its benefits: An overview of hunting in Africa with special reference to Tanzania. In H. H. T. Prins, T. H. Dolan, & J. G. Grootenhuys (Eds.), *Conservation of wildlife by sustainable use*. Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Kamugisha, J. R., Ogotu, Z. A., & Stahl, M. (1997). *Parks and people: Conservation and livelihoods at crossroads. Four case histories*. Nairobi: Regional Soil Conservation Unit African Centre for Technology Studies.
- Lamprey, R. H., & Mugisha, A. (2009). The re-introduction of recreational hunting in Uganda. In B. Dickson, J. Hutton, & B. Adams (Eds.), *Recreational hunting, conservation and rural livelihoods: Science and practice* (1st ed.). Oxford: Wiley Publishers.
- Lamprey, R. H., Buhanga, E., & Omoding, J. (2003). *A study of wildlife distributions, wildlife management systems and options for wildlife-based livelihoods in Uganda*. Kampala: International Food Policy Research Institute and USAID.
- Lindsey, P. A., Frank, L. G., Mathieson, A., Alexander, R., & Roma Nach, S. S. (2006). Trophy hunting and conservation in Africa: Problems and one potential solution. *Conservation Biology*, 21(3), 880–883.
- Lindsey, P. A., Frank, L. G., Alexander, R., Mathieson, A., & Romanach, S. S. (2007). Trophy hunting and conservation in Africa: Problems and one potential solution. *Conservation Biology*, 21, 880–883.
- Loveridge, A. J., Reynolds, J. C., & Milner-Gulland, E. (2006). Does sport hunting benefit conservation? In D. W. Macdonald & K. Service (Eds.), *Key topics in conservation biology* (pp. 224–240). Oxford: Blackwell.
- McAfee, K. (1999). Selling nature to save it? Biodiversity and green developmentalism. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 17, 133–154.
- MTTI. (1999). *The Uganda wildlife policy*. Kampala: Ministry of Tourism, Trade and Industry.
- Muhimbura, A. & Namara, A. (2009). *The pilot sport hunting program in the ranches surrounding Lake Mburo National Park* (Project evaluation report – Draft 2).
- Ochieng, A. (2011). *Linking tourism, conservation and livelihoods: An analysis of sport hunting around Lake Mburo National Park, Uganda*. MSc Thesis, Wageningen University.
- UWA. (2001). *Professional hunting agreement in the former Ankole ranching scheme between Uganda Wildlife Authority, Rurambira Wildlife Association and Game Trails (U) Ltd*. Kampala: Uganda Wildlife Authority.
- UWA. (2003). *Professional hunting agreement in the former Ankole Ranching Scheme between Uganda Wildlife Authority and Rwakanombe Wildlife Association and Game Trails (U) Limited*. Kampala: Uganda Wildlife Authority.
- UWA. (2004). *Community conservation policy*. Kampala: Uganda Wildlife Authority. Unpublished policy document.
- UWA. (2005). *The implementation of sport hunting project on the ranches outside LMNP: Report on sport hunting with proposals for change. July 2005*. Kampala: Uganda Wildlife Authority. Unpublished policy document.
- UWA. (2011). *Sport hunting agreement for LMNP*. Kampala: Uganda Wildlife Authority.
- UWA. (2012a). *Sport hunting quota allocation and animal fees for LMNP and KWR*. Kampala: Uganda Wildlife Authority. Unpublished.
- UWA. (2012b). *Sport hunting companies in Uganda*. Kampala: Uganda Wildlife Authority.
- UWA. (n.d.). *Wildlife use right class A animal quota – October 2004–September 2005. Unpublished policy document*. Kampala: Uganda Wildlife Authority