



BRIEFING PAPER

Number 7908, 3 March 2017

Trophy Hunting: UK and international policy

By Alison Pratt
and David Hirst

Contents:

1. Trophy Hunting
2. What is the Government position?
3. International action to combat the trafficking of illegal wildlife products
4. Can trophy hunting be sustainable?



Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Summary | 3 |
| 1. Trophy Hunting | 4 |
| What is trophy hunting? | 4 |
| How can animal trophies be imported/exported? | 4 |
| What is the law on importing trophies into the UK? | 5 |
| 2. What is the Government position? | 7 |
| 2.1 Sustainable trade in trophy hunting | 7 |
| Why has the Government not introduced an outright ban? | 8 |
| 3. International action to combat the trafficking of illegal wildlife products | 9 |
| 3.1 Illegal wildlife trade (IWT) conferences around the world | 10 |
| 3.2 EU Action Plan | 11 |
| 3.3 Countries which have banned the import of lion trophies | 12 |
| 4. Can trophy hunting be sustainable? | 13 |
| 4.1 Trophy hunting as a means of conservation | 13 |
| 4.2 Is trophy hunting unsustainable? | 14 |

Summary

Several 'trophy animal' species are now endangered or becoming threatened; trophy hunting may be at least partly responsible for this. The UK Government have taken actions to combat the problem. The Government also believes that, when carefully managed, hunting can play a part in species preservation.

What is trophy hunting?

Trophy hunters pay a fee to experience the hunting of an animal for the sole purpose of winning a part of its body as a "trophy"—such as antlers, horns or, in the case of lions, the head or skin. This paper gives some examples relating to the sport of hunting lions.

The management of the importing of trophies is regulated by UK law which stems from EU regulations and CITES, an international agreement between governments, which provides the legal framework for these measures. Statistics from CITES show an upward trend in the numbers of lion trophies exported over the past five years. Certain species have been moved by CITES to Appendix I, which lists animals that are the most endangered. In some countries stricter controls have been introduced on the importing of such trophies owing to concerns over sustainability.

Government position

Although the UK Government considers that properly managed hunting can help conservation, it has also stated that it will "[ban lion trophy imports by the end of 2017](#)" if there are no improvements to the methods of lion hunting in certain countries.

Cecil the Lion and illegal poaching

The killing of Cecil the Lion in Zimbabwe in the summer of 2015 prompted an international outcry and highlighted issues surrounding the sustainability of the wildlife trade. Subsequently certain countries—Australia, France and the Netherlands—implemented bans on the importing of lion trophies.

In addition to the issue of the import and export of hunting trophies, there is concern surrounding the illegal poaching of, and trade in, wildlife products. This is a lucrative market which is [estimated](#) to be worth between \$15 and \$20 billion annually.

International conferences

The UK Government has taken a lead in the international response to this issue, hosting the [2014 Illegal Wildlife Trade \(IWT\) Conference](#). At this Conference the government [declared](#) a commitment to ending the illegal wildlife trade, working with international partners to improve enforcement and reduce demand for products. The UK [recently announced](#) that it will host a further IWT Conference in early 2018.

The sustainability of trophy hunting

It has been argued that trophy hunting can be a useful wildlife management tool and that banning it would do more harm than good. When properly managed, the money raised by hunting can be reinvested into conservation and biodiversity. The World Wildlife Fund support this approach. However some organisations counter that the sport is "cruel" and the industry is "corrupt", with little of the money raised by hunting finding its way into conservation efforts. The organisations say that more money can be raised from tourist safaris than by hunting animals.

1. Trophy Hunting

What is trophy hunting?

Trophy hunting is the pursuit and killing of certain animals for the purpose of obtaining a certain body part as a trophy. The [International Fund for Animal Welfare](#) (IFAW) defines trophy hunting as:

The activity of chasing and killing wild animals or game, especially for food or sport. "Trophy hunting", specifically, is a form of hunting in which the hunter's explicit goal is to obtain the hunted animal's carcass or body part, such as the head or hide, as a trophy that represents the success of the hunt.¹

Trophy hunting is legal in certain parts of the world, as long as proper permits have been obtained. It is not to be confused with poaching, which is the illegal pursuit of game.

How can animal trophies be imported/exported?

Many trophy hunters are also tourists, and once they have pursued and killed their trophy, they normally want to return the trophy to their home country. For this—import and export—permits are required under the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES).

CITES is an international agreement between governments, which provides the legal framework and common procedural mechanisms for regulating international trade in wild animals and plants.²

Its aim is to ensure that international trade in wild animals and plants does not threaten their survival. Each country that is a (voluntary) signatory to the convention must abide by internationally agreed rules that regulate protected species.

Box 1: Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Flora and Fauna (CITES)

What is CITES?

The Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Flora and Fauna (CITES), is an international agreement between governments to ensure that international trade in specimens of wild animals and plants does not threaten their survival. The [text of the Convention](#) was agreed at a meeting of representatives of 80 countries in the US on 3 March 1973, and on 1 July 1975 CITES entered into force. CITES is a voluntary international agreement which is legally binding on the Parties—in other words, they have to implement the Convention—it does not take the place of national laws.³

¹ IFAW, [Killing for Trophies: an analysis of the global trophy hunting trade](#), 14 June 2016

² European Commission, Environment, [Background on CITES](#), [website accessed November 2016]

³ CITES, ["What is CITES?"](#) [accessed on 6 February 2017]

How does CITES work?

CITES works by subjecting international trade in specimens of selected species to certain controls. All import, export, re-export and introduction from the sea of species covered by the Convention has to be authorised through a licensing system.⁴

The species covered by CITES are listed in three Appendices, according to the degree of protection they need:

- Appendix I includes species threatened with extinction. Trade in specimens of these species is permitted only in exceptional circumstances.
- Appendix II includes species not necessarily threatened with extinction, but in which trade must be controlled in order to avoid utilisation incompatible with their survival.
- Appendix III contains species that are protected in at least one country, which has asked other CITES Parties for assistance in controlling the trade.⁵

What is the law on importing trophies into the UK?

Under international rules set out by CITES, a hunting trophy from a species listed on Appendix I or II of the Convention can be exported only if the exporting country is satisfied that the hunt was legal and sustainable.

Import controls are implemented at an EU level. CITES is implemented within Europe through two EC Regulations ([338/97](#) and [865/06](#) as amended). These Regulations implement CITES in a stricter manner than is required by the Convention.⁶ [The Control in Endangered Species \(Enforcement\) Regulations 1997](#) (as amended) creates offences in relation to Regulations 338/97, allowing CITES to be enforced in the UK.

Former Defra Minister Rory Stewart highlighted growing concern about the sustainability of the hunting of certain species in answer to a PQ on 27 June 2016.⁷ The Minister said that stricter controls have therefore been introduced on the import of hunting trophies of six species, listed in Annex XIII to the Commission Regulation (EC) No 865/2006:

- Southern White Rhinoceros *Ceratotherium simum simum*
- Common Hippopotamus *Hippopotamus amphibius*
- African Elephant *Loxodonta africana*
- Argali Sheep *Ovis ammon*
- Lion *Panthera leo* and
- Polar Bear *Ursus maritimus*⁸

⁴ CITES, "[How CITES works](#)" [accessed on 6 February 2017]

⁵ [Ibid](#)

⁶ JNCC, "[Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora \(CITES\)](#)" [accessed on 6 February 2017]

⁷ [PQ 40644 \[on Animal Products: Imports\], 27 June 2016](#)

⁸ [PQ 40644 \[on Animal Products: Imports\], 27 June 2016](#)

6 Trophy Hunting: UK and international policy

This table shows trends in the global volume of legal trade in trophy specimens of these six species over the past five years. The numbers show an increase in specimens traded for the white rhino, the sheep and the lion, while the hippo, African elephant and polar bear all showed a decrease over this period.

Trade in trophies by species, Global, 2011 - 2015

| Species | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 |
|---------------------|------|------|------|------|------|
| S. White Rhino | 45 | 38 | 62 | 73 | 70 |
| Common Hippopotamus | 411 | 476 | 352 | 298 | 258 |
| African Elephant | 697 | 1010 | 900 | 914 | 430 |
| Argali Sheep | 163 | 165 | 148 | 129 | 176 |
| Lion | 691 | 855 | 841 | 932 | 969 |
| Polar Bear | 131 | 136 | 25 | 84 | 13 |

Source: CITES Trade Database

Notes: May include some double counting, as individual specimens can be re-exported from countries.

Some trades may appear in wrong year, as import / export permits may be issued ahead of transaction completion

Box 2: Trade in animal trophies after Brexit

The UK and the EU are both parties to CITES, the international agreement between governments which aims to protect species of fauna and flora from exploitation. As set out above, the CITES controls are implemented by regulations at an EU level. These in turn are then transposed into UK legislation through [The Control in Endangered Species \(Enforcement\) Regulations 1997](#) (as amended).

The EU regulations are stronger than those imposed by CITES.⁹ It is therefore possible that the regulations covering the trade in endangered species could become weaker once the UK leaves the EU, the UK would also have the power to strengthen them.

The UK Government has announced that it will introduce a "Great Repeal Bill" to bring over all EU legislation. On 10 October 2016 David Davis, the Secretary of State for the Department for Exiting the European Union, explained to the House that the Great Repeal Bill would repeal the European Communities Act 1972 (the legislation that gives direct effect to all EU law in Britain) and convert existing EU law into domestic law, wherever practical.¹⁰

At present all commitments to CITES must be EU authorised. Once the UK has left the EU, it will be able to contribute individually. George Eustice said in a recent debate on animal welfare after Brexit: "we have a manifesto commitment to place greater emphasis on animal welfare in future policy".¹¹

⁹ European Commission, [Wildlife Trade Regulations in the European Union](#), 2010

¹⁰ [HC Deb 10 October 2016 vol 615 c40](#)

¹¹ [HC Deb 24 January 2017 vol 620 c94WH](#)

2. What is the Government position?

2.1 Sustainable trade in trophy hunting

The Government has explained that it does not plan to introduce a general ban on hunting trophies, but is seeking to ensure that trade is sustainable. On 27 June 2016, then Defra Minister, Rory Stewart, explained that:

The Government considers that properly managed, legal and sustainable trophy hunting can play a part in species conservation efforts, including by providing an important source of funding for conservation in some countries. In view of this, we have no plans to introduce legislation banning the import of all trophies of Appendix I and II species. We will however continue to monitor the impact of trophy hunting and will work to put in place greater protection, including prohibiting imports, if this is shown to be needed.¹²

Box 3: The sustainability of hunting

It is often claimed that “responsibly managed hunting” can be a useful wildlife management tool.¹³

The International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) has argued that “with effective governance and management trophy hunting can and does have positive impacts”. IUCN argues that trophy hunting can:

- generate incentives for landowners [...] to conserve or restore wildlife on their land.
- generate revenue for wildlife management and conservation, including anti-poaching activities
- increase tolerance for living with wildlife, reducing the effects of human-wildlife conflicts and reduce illegal killing.¹⁴

The IUCN further argues that case studies have noted that well-managed trophy hunting can promote population recovery, protection and maintenance of habitat.¹⁵

However, other organisations, such as Born Free, argue for example that that the way forward is “compassionate solutions to conservation challenges”. They reject the notion that trophy hunting can help conservation and instead promote the concept of “non-consumptive opportunities to generate income from wildlife”.¹⁶

A particular concern is whether the revenue from organised hunting is actually getting to the conservation projects. A report carried out by a US Committee found

¹² [PQ 40644 \[on Animal Products: Imports\], 27 June 2016](#)

¹³ [Ibid](#)

¹⁴ IUCN, [Informing decisions on trophy hunting](#), published April 2016

¹⁵ [Ibid](#)

¹⁶ The Born Free Foundation, [Shooting animals for ‘sport’](#), [accessed 7 February 2017]

that out of the four African countries it studied, only one of them demonstrated positive outcomes in conservation and wildlife numbers.¹⁷

In October 2016, [CITES Parties unanimously adopted a resolution](#) that stated that “well-managed and sustainable trophy hunting is consistent with and contributes to species conservation, as it provides both livelihood opportunities for rural communities and incentives for habitat conservation, and generates benefits which can be invested for conservation purposes.”¹⁸

See section 4 for a broader discussion on this subject.

Furthermore, Rory Stewart explained that the Government was concerned about the impact of the hunting for trophies on lion conservation and that it would consider an outright ban if standards in the way animals were being hunted in certain countries were not being met:

In recognition of the real concerns about the impact of trophy hunting on lion conservation, I announced in Parliament on 24 November 2015 that the Government will ban lion trophy imports by the end of 2017 unless there are improvements in the way hunting takes place in certain countries, judged against strict criteria. We will work with our European and international partners, and experts in the field, to reach a common approach to this issue.¹⁹

Why has the Government not introduced an outright ban?

A number of countries around the world have introduced outright bans on the importing of lion trophies and it has been argued that the UK should follow suit.²⁰ The UK Government has explained that it is closely monitoring the impacts of bans on hunting trophies introduced in France and Australia, but it would prefer action to be taken multilaterally. In July 2016, Rory Stewart explained that the Government was working on a common EU-US position, which could make a “huge difference”:

We are looking closely at what Australia and France are doing. We have been working on a common EU-US position in order to change practices in Africa. It makes a huge difference that we do this together as 700 million people in the EU and the US rather than trying to do it individually.²¹

¹⁷ [Missing the Mark: African trophy hunting fails to show consistent conservation benefits](#), House Committee on Natural Resources, 13 June 2016

¹⁸ [Resolution Conf. 17.XX Trade in hunting trophies of species listed in Appendix I or II](#), CITES, CoP17 Com. I. 3.

¹⁹ [PQ 40644 \[on Animal Products: Imports\]](#), 27 June 2016

²⁰ IFAW, [British people are calling for an end to lion trophy hunting](#), 6 May 2016

²¹ [HC Deb 7 July 2016 vol 612 c1022](#)

3. International action to combat the trafficking of illegal wildlife products

Increasing concern for several animal species being pushed to the brink of extinction has prompted responses from around the globe. In November 2010, the International Consortium on Combatting Wildlife Crime (ICWC), which encompasses CITES, INTERPOL, Office on Drugs and Crime, the World Bank and World Customs Organisation, was created to provide countries with enforcement support.²² Moreover, there have been several global meetings in recent years raising awareness of, and taking action to tackle, the global trade in wildlife products, and in 2015, international coverage of the killing of Cecil the Lion by an American dentist further highlighted the issue of trophy hunting.

Box 4: Cecil the Lion

Cecil the Lion, one of Africa's most famous lions and the "star attraction" of Hwange National Park in Zimbabwe, was killed in July 2015 by an American "trophy hunter".

Cecil was a subject of the Hwange Lion Research, funded by Oxford University and his killing highlighted the issue of poorly regulated hunting. It was also controversial owing to the fact that the hunter and wildlife guides lured the lion out of the national park using bait and shot the lion with a crossbow—a method often used by hunters trying to evade detection.²³

The incident sparked international coverage and led to demands for an EU ban on importing lion trophies. It has also led to policy change in certain countries (see Section 3.3 below). Several campaigns and petitions were launched, with those at care2 petitions and change.org, receiving more than a million signatures.^{24 25}

Full details of the incident can be found at the Zimbabwe Conservation Task Force [website](#).

In addition to the issue of the import and export of hunting trophies there is broader concern about the illegal trade of wildlife products. This lucrative market is estimated at being worth between \$15 and \$20 billion annually,²⁶ and is thought to be one of the highest value illicit trade sectors in the world.²⁷ While CITIES deals with the legal trade in

²² UN Environment Programme (UNEP), *Illegal Trade in Wildlife Fact Sheet*, May 2016

²³ Zimbabwe Conservation Task Force, [Cecil the Lion](#), 28 July 2015

²⁴ Care2 Petitions, ['Demand Justice for Cecil the Lion in Zimbabwe'](#), [accessed 11 January 2017]

²⁵ Change.org, ['Justice for Cecil the iconic collared lion slaughtered by trophy hunter in Zimbabwe!'](#), [accessed 11 January 2017]

²⁶ UNEP, *Illegal Trade in Wildlife Fact Sheet*, May 2016

²⁷ Oxford Martin School, [Programmes: Illegal Wildlife Trade](#), Accessed: 11 November 2016

species, illegal wildlife trade was a strong focus at the recent CITIES conference in Johannesburg.²⁸

Measures the UK Government have taken in response to this threat, include hosting the 2014 London Declaration on wildlife trade, which was signed by 46 countries. In February 2014, the Government published its [Commitment to Action on the Illegal Wildlife Trade](#).²⁹

3.1 Illegal wildlife trade (IWT) conferences around the world

In the past three years there have been several international meetings where countries from around the globe have come together to combat the illegal wildlife trade.

2014 Illegal Wildlife Trade Conference in London

At the 2014 [IWT conference](#) in London, William Hague [issued a statement to parliament](#) on the outcomes of the conference. He said:

Participating governments at the conference agreed a political declaration that should mark the turning point in the fight to save endangered species and to end the illegal wildlife trade. Governments committed to action designed to strengthen law enforcement, reduce demand and support alternative livelihoods of communities affected by poaching and the trafficking. Notably, governments committed themselves for the first time to renounce the use of products from species threatened with extinction, which sends the strong signal that governments will not procure the things that drive demand for illegal wildlife products.³⁰

2015 Conference on Illegal Wildlife Trade in Kasane, Botswana

The second IWT Conference was held on 25 March 2015 in Botswana. Participants reviewed progress made since the London conference held in 2014. Following the conference the [Kasane statement](#) was issued, signalling a political commitment made by the representatives of governments at the conference.³¹ This document builds on the previous year's London declaration commitments. The UK, as Secretariat to the Kasane Conference, worked with partner countries to compile [a report](#), which noted that "many positive actions have been taken by Governments to help reduce demand and eradicate the market for illegal wildlife products".³² In the report, the UK Government made a

²⁸ [17th Conference of the Parties to the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species - HCWS198](#)

²⁹ HM Government, "[UK Commitment to Action on the Illegal Wildlife Trade \(IWT\)](#)", February 2014

³⁰ GOV.UK – Written statement to Parliament, [London Conference on the Illegal Wildlife Trade](#), 24 March 2014

³¹ [Kasane Conference on the The Illegal Wildlife Trade: Statement](#), 25 March 2015

³² [Kasane Conference on the Illegal Wildlife Trade: Review of Progress](#)

commitment to provide a £10 million fund to support the efforts of the “UK and other countries to tackle the illegal trade in wildlife products.”³³

2016 conference on the Illegal Wildlife Trade (IWT) in Hanoi

The UK Government supported Vietnam in hosting the third “high level” conference on 17 November 2017.³⁴ This conference built on the London and Botswana conferences held in 2014 and 2015 respectively.³⁵

Following the Hanoi Conference, Secretary of State Andrea Leadsom issued a written statement reporting on the commitments she had announced at the conference. As well as committing “an additional £13 million in UK funding for IWT” she mentioned “a number of new initiatives, including expanded British military training for African park rangers [and] a project with China to deliver joint training to African border forces”.³⁶ She also made a commitment to supply “up to £4 million for the International Consortium for Combating Wildlife Crime”.³⁷

The UK announced that it will host another Conference in London in early 2018 to review progress of proposed government actions. Andrea Leadsom said in her statement on the outcome of the conference:

Finally I was also pleased to announce that the UK will host a fourth high-level meeting on IWT in 2018, to ensure that this urgent global issue stays at the top of the political agenda and that we continue to deliver on our manifesto commitment to lead the world in tackling IWT.³⁸

3.2 EU Action Plan

This issue has been the subject of considerable debate in Europe. In January 2016, a majority of MEPs signed a Written Declaration calling on EU countries to examine “the possibility of restricting all import of trophies into the EU”.³⁹

On 26 February 2016, the [EU launched an Action Plan](#) to tackle illegal wildlife trafficking. The Plan contained 32 measures, which must be carried out by 2020 by the EU and its Member States. These measures focused on three main areas:

- Prevent trafficking and reduce supply and demand of illegal wildlife products: for example by the end of 2016 the Commission will prepare guidelines aiming to suspend the export of old ivory items from the EU;

³³ [Ibid](#)

³⁴ [Hanoi Conference on Illegal Wildlife Trade, 17-18 November 2016, Viet Nam](#)

³⁵ [PQ HL2627 \[on Conference on the Illegal Wildlife Trade: Hanoi\], 08 November 2016](#)

³⁶ [HC Deb 01 December 2016 c56WS](#)

³⁷ [Ibid](#)

³⁸ [HC Deb 1 December 2016 vol 617 c56WS](#)

³⁹ [‘Written Declaration submitted under Rule 136 of the Rules of Procedure on trophy hunting’, European Parliament, 18 January 2016](#)

- Enhance implementation of existing rules and combat organised crime more effectively by increasing cooperation between competent enforcement agencies such as Europol;
- Strengthen cooperation between source, destination and transit countries, including strategic EU financial support to tackle trafficking in source countries, help build capacity for enforcement and provide long term sources of income to rural communities living in wildlife-rich areas

3.3 Countries which have banned the import of lion trophies

Australia

Australia introduced a ban in March 2015, with the Environment Minister, Greg Hunt responding to the practice of canned hunting by imposing a total ban on all African lion trophy imports.⁴⁰

France

Four months after Cecil the Lion was killed, France's environment minister, Ségolène Royale, stated that she had instructed officials to stop issuing permits for lion trophies.^{41 42} This move was called a "game-changing decision" by the Humane Society International, which also reported that Ms Royale has said that her government will "seek stricter" regulations on the importing of hunting trophies to the EU.⁴³

The Netherlands

The Netherlands introduced the strictest ban on the importing of hunting trophies in the EU. The Netherlands Government issued the following statement in 2016:

With immediate effect, hunting trophies of a large number of species may no longer be imported into the Netherlands. These include trophies of white rhinos, elephants, cheetahs, lions, hippos and polar bears.⁴⁴

⁴⁰ International Fund for Animal Welfare, [Canned! No more lion trophies to be imported into Australia](#), 13 March 2015

⁴¹ International Fund for Animal Welfare, [France becomes the 1st European state to ban lion trophies](#), 23 November 2015

⁴² Guardian, [France bans import of lion hunt trophies](#), 19 November 2015

⁴³ Humane Society International, [France Bans African Lion Hunting Trophy Imports](#), 20 November 2017

⁴⁴ Government of the Netherlands, [Additional hunting trophies added to the import prohibition list](#), 2 May 2016

4. Can trophy hunting be sustainable?

The question of trophy hunting as a wildlife conservation and management tool is a contentious one, with no consensus.

In answer to a PQ in September 2016, the Government stated that it had not assessed the impact of lion imports into the UK on conservation in the country of origin, but that they do assess the impact of lion imports on the conservation of the species:

We have not carried out an assessment of the effect of lion imports into the UK on wider conservation in the country of origin. However as part of the application process for an import permit, we assess the impact of lion imports into the UK on the conservation of the species. The UK's scientific advisors for fauna, the Joint Nature Conservation Committee, consider for each lion imported into the UK whether the import would be harmful to the conservation of the species or the extent of its range. An import permit is only issued if the trade is not considered to be detrimental to the survival of the species in the wild.⁴⁵

4.1 Trophy hunting as a means of conservation

There are a number of organisations that argue that a regulated hunting industry is better than an outright ban, because these regulated hunts bring in much-needed money for conservation.⁴⁶ The World Wildlife Fund (WWF), for instance, supports trophy hunting in the context of conservation programmes that “benefit the wildlife populations of affected species, their habitats and associated ecosystems”.⁴⁷ The WWF believes that the programmes should also benefit the local communities.

Researchers from Cambridge, Adelaide and Helsinki Universities have argued that banning trophy hunting would do “more harm than good” in African countries that have little money to invest in conservation and biodiversity.⁴⁸ The authors believe that mandatory levies should be applied to safari operators and which are then invested directly into trust funds for conservation and management. The article, *Banning Trophy Hunting Will Exacerbate Biodiversity Loss* was published in [Trends in Ecology and Evolution](#) in February 2016.

⁴⁵ [PQ 46466 \[Lions: Hunting\], 14 October 2016](#)

⁴⁶ [‘Can Lion Trophy Hunting Support Conservation?’](#), *National Geographic*, 29 July 2015

⁴⁷ World Wildlife Fund, [WWF and trophy hunting](#), [accessed on 7 February 2017]

⁴⁸ University of Cambridge Research, [Banning trophy hunting could do more harm than good](#), 11 January 2016

In October 2016, [CITES Parties unanimously adopted a resolution](#) that stated that

Well-managed and sustainable trophy hunting is consistent with and contributes to species conservation, as it provides both livelihood opportunities for rural communities and incentives for habitat conservation, and generates benefits which can be invested for conservation purposes.⁴⁹

4.2 Is trophy hunting unsustainable?

Some organisations argue that trophy hunting is a “cruel” industry, that the money raised from the practice does not help conservation and that its practice leads to the loss of wildlife.

The Born Free Foundation, a wildlife charity, is wholly against the idea that trophy hunting can help animal conservation. It argues that the way forward is:

compassionate solutions to conservation challenges, which encourage the development of sustainable and non-consumptive opportunities to generate income from wildlife.⁵⁰

The charity also argues against the “canned hunting” industry, where animals are bred for the sole purpose of being shot by hunters. This practice is most common in South Africa where “up to” 7,000 lions are bred in captivity, forming part of a tourist attraction where cubs are petted and older lions can be fed.⁵¹ The Professional Hunters’ Association of South Africa have voted to “distance the association from captive-bred lion-hunting” until breeders can prove “the conservation value of this practice”.⁵²

The League against Cruel Sports see trophy hunting as an activity that “belong(s) in the past”.⁵³ It argues that the sport should be “banned on animal welfare grounds”.⁵⁴ It also states that tourist safaris are worth more to local economies than trophy hunting.⁵⁵

The US House of Representatives Committee on Natural Resources⁵⁶ looked at trophy hunting in its report, *Missing the Mark*, published 2016. The Committee noted that often the money raised by trophy hunting failed to contribute to conservation.

The report concluded that the four African countries it assessed—Namibia, South Africa, Tanzania and Botswana—did have frameworks

⁴⁹ [Resolution Conf. 17.XX Trade in hunting trophies of species listed in Appendix I or II, CITES, CoP17 Com. I. 3.](#)

⁵⁰ The Born Free Foundation, [Shooting animals for ‘sport’](#), [accessed 7 February 2017]

⁵¹ [Inside the Grim Lives of Africa’s Captive Lions](#), *National Geographic*, 22 July 2015

⁵² Humane Society International, [France Bans African Lion Hunting Trophy Imports](#), 20 November 2015

⁵³ League against Cruel Sports, [Trophy Hunting](#), [accessed 22 February 2017]

⁵⁴ [Ibid](#)

⁵⁵ [Ibid](#)

⁵⁶ [House Committee on Natural Resources](#), United States House of Representatives

that could ensure trophy hunting benefits conservation, but that the implementation of the framework had not produced the desired results. Of these four countries, only Namibia had demonstrated “communal conservation efforts and increase [of] some wildlife populations through selective trophy hunting”.⁵⁷

The report stated that, on the whole, trophy hunting was having a negative impact on the lion population in sub-Saharan Africa.

⁵⁷ [*Missing the Mark: African trophy hunting fails to show consistent conservation benefits*](#), House Committee on Natural Resources, 13 June 2016

About the Library

The House of Commons Library research service provides MPs and their staff with the impartial briefing and evidence base they need to do their work in scrutinising Government, proposing legislation, and supporting constituents.

As well as providing MPs with a confidential service we publish open briefing papers, which are available on the Parliament website.

Every effort is made to ensure that the information contained in these publicly available research briefings is correct at the time of publication. Readers should be aware however that briefings are not necessarily updated or otherwise amended to reflect subsequent changes.

If you have any comments on our briefings please email papers@parliament.uk. Authors are available to discuss the content of this briefing only with Members and their staff.

If you have any general questions about the work of the House of Commons you can email hcenquiries@parliament.uk.

Disclaimer

This information is provided to Members of Parliament in support of their parliamentary duties. It is a general briefing only and should not be relied on as a substitute for specific advice. The House of Commons or the author(s) shall not be liable for any errors or omissions, or for any loss or damage of any kind arising from its use, and may remove, vary or amend any information at any time without prior notice.

The House of Commons accepts no responsibility for any references or links to, or the content of, information maintained by third parties. This information is provided subject to the [conditions of the Open Parliament Licence](#).