

Written evidence submitted by Mr Tom Radandt (AAB0028)

But prohibiting the import of hunted animals, you remove the economic value of wildlife. Local people will only tolerate wildlife when they receive some value from it. Revenue from responsible hunting employs local people and improve communities. When responsible hunting is not on the landscape people move into areas once managed for wildlife, converting land to agriculture. On those farms and crop fields wildlife is not tolerated and therefore it is killed with on economic return.

In Africa, there is more habitat managed for wildlife and protected from poaching, with funds generated from responsible hunting then all protected areas combined.

It is important to look at each population of animals when talking about endangered species. Responsible, regulated hunting does not harvest from populations that are a conservation concern. Elephants in South Africa or Namibia is not endangered. They are overpopulated and destroying their habitat. Elephants in other, less stable countries, are more of a conservation concern. A blanket label is not an accurate assessment of the situation.

The unintended consequences of this proposal are more land converted to agriculture, more human wildlife conflicts, less employment in rural communities, less public services in those rural communities, and decrease in biodiversity/animal numbers.

September 2021