



Strasbourg, 29 November 2007
[tpvs07erev_2007.doc]

T-PVS (2007) 7 revised

CONVENTION ON THE CONSERVATION OF EUROPEAN WILDLIFE
AND NATURAL HABITATS

Standing Committee

27th meeting
Strasbourg, 26-29 November 2007

European Charter on Hunting and Biodiversity

Document prepared by

*Mr Scott Brainerd, Wildlife Biologist,
Norwegian Association. of Hunters & Anglers, Norway*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION.....	3
1.1	Background	3
1.2	Terms and concepts	3
1.3	Scope	5
1.4	Purpose	5
1.5	Goals.....	5
1.6	Objectives	5
2.	CONTEXT	6
2.1	Sustainable Hunting.....	6
	<i>2.1.1 International agreements concerning sustainable use of wild living resources</i>	<i>6</i>
	<i>2.1.2 The European context</i>	<i>7</i>
	<i>2.1.3 Sustainable Hunting in Europe</i>	<i>7</i>
	<i>2.1.4 The Large Carnivore Initiative</i>	<i>9</i>
2.2	Hunting tourism.....	10
	<i>2.2.1 European hunting tourism</i>	<i>10</i>
	<i>2.2.2 International regulation of wildlife trade</i>	<i>10</i>
	<i>2.2.3 Sustainable hunting tourism</i>	<i>11</i>
2.3	Standards for European hunters.....	12
	<i>2.3.1 European policy regarding hunter standards.....</i>	<i>12</i>
2.4	Conclusions.....	13
3.	EUROPEAN CHARTER ON HUNTING AND BIODIVERSITY	13
3.1	Principle 1 – Favour multi-level governance that maximises benefit for biodiversity conservation and society.....	13
3.2	Principle 2 – Ensure that regulations are understandable and respected	13
3.3	Principle 3 – Ensure that harvest is ecologically sustainable.....	14
3.4	Principle 4 – Maintain wild populations of indigenous species with adaptive gene pools... 	15
3.5	Principle 5 – Maintain environments that support healthy and robust populations of harvestable species.....	16
3.6	Principle 6 – Encourage use to provide economic incentives for conservation	16
3.7.	Principle 7 – Ensure that harvest is properly utilised and wastage avoided	17
3.8	Principle 8 – Empower local stakeholders and hold them accountable.....	17
3.9	Principle 9 – Competence and responsibility are desirable among users of wild resources	18
3.10	Principle 10 – Minimise avoidable suffering by animals.....	18
3.11	Principle 11 – Encourage cooperation between all stakeholders in management of harvested species, associated species and their habitats	19
3.12	Principle 12 – Encourage acceptance by society of sustainable, consumptive use as a conservation tool	19
4.	APPENDICES.....	21
4.1	Appendix 1 – Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines for the sustainable use of biodiversity ...	21
4.2	Appendix 2 – Malawi Principles for the Ecosystem Approach	22
4.3	Appendix 3 – Relationship between Hunting Charter and AAPG/Malawi Principles	23

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

The Standing Committee of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe (PACE) adopted Recommendation 1689 (2004)¹ regarding Hunting and Europe's environmental balance on 23 November 2004 in Warsaw, Poland. This document recommended *inter alia* that the Committee of Ministers (CM) of the Council of Europe (CoE) “draw up a European charter on hunting, as a guide setting out common principles and good practices for hunting, particularly for the organisation of hunting tourism on the continent”². The Bureau of the Standing Committee of the Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats (Bern Convention) adopted its Opinion at its meeting of 8 April 2005³. In this Opinion, the Bureau welcomed the Recommendation, stating that “it considers that hunting, if properly managed, can play a role in maintaining and enhancing many areas of natural interest in Europe”. The Bureau further welcomed *inter alia* “the idea of elaborating, in cooperation with concerned stakeholders, a European Charter of Hunting dealing with all relevant aspects of hunting and wildlife conservation”. To this end, the Bureau recommended that “the Deputies invite the Standing Committee to the Bern Convention (SC) to consider the elaboration, in collaboration with concerned stakeholders, of a European Charter on Hunting dealing with all relevant aspects of hunting and wildlife conservation”.

The Deputies considered this issue at their 909th meeting, brought it to the attention of their governments, as well as of the SC for information and possible comments, and invited the Rapporteur Group on Education, Culture, Sport, Youth and Environment (GR-C) to prepare a reply⁴. The CM then informed PACE that the Bern Convention Bureau was in favour of elaborating such a Charter, in cooperation with the stakeholders concerned, which would deal with all relevant aspects of hunting and wildlife conservation. The Bureau decided to include this project in the agenda of the next meeting of the SC and, subject to its agreement, in the work programme for 2006. Pursuant to this recommendation, the SC appointed a Working Group (WG) of relevant experts and representatives from non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and governments of Member States to undertake the formulation of the European Charter on Hunting and Biodiversity in November 2005. This Charter is the result of a process which has involved the active participation by the WG on the basis of draft input by contracted consultants. This process was aided by the World Conservation Union/Species Survival Commission - European Sustainable Use Specialist Group (IUCN/SSC-ESUSG), the Federation of Associations for Hunting and Conservation of the European Union (FACE), and the International Council for Game and Wildlife Conservation (CIC).

1.2 Terms and concepts

Game: Game species include all wild avian and terrestrial mammal species for which hunting is legally permitted in countries that have signed the Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats (Bern, 1979).

Wildlife Management: The application of science-based and local knowledge in the stewardship of wild (including game) animal populations and their habitats in a manner beneficial to the environment and society.

Hunting tour operators: Agents or agencies that directly or indirectly provide services (guiding, outfitting, lodging, hunting opportunity) for hunter tourists.

Hunting: The pursuit and/or take of wild game species by all methods permitted by law within signatory countries. Motivations for this activity include consumption (use of meat, hides, furs and/or trophies), recreation, and/or management of game populations.

¹ <http://assembly.coe.int/Documents/AdoptedText/ta04/EREC1689.htm>

² Paragraph 6.i.

³ http://www.coe.int/t/e/cultural_cooperation/environment/nature_and_biological_diversity/nature_protection/sc2_5_tpvs03rev.pdf?L=E

⁴ [https://wcd.coe.int/ViewDoc.jsp?Ref=CM/AS\(2005\)Rec1689&Sector=secCM&Language=lanEnglish&Ver=final](https://wcd.coe.int/ViewDoc.jsp?Ref=CM/AS(2005)Rec1689&Sector=secCM&Language=lanEnglish&Ver=final)

From a socio-economic perspective, there are two broad, but not exclusive, sub-categories of hunting : “*Resident hunting*” and “*Hunting tourism*”⁵:

Resident hunting: Resident hunting is conducted by hunters within their country of residence, and most commonly in the area where they physically reside and have hunting rights. Most resident hunters have strong socio-cultural ties to their hunting grounds, and are therefore highly motivated to apply their knowledge on local conditions and traditions to the conservation and management of local game species and their habitats. Emphasis is generally placed upon physical recreation, consumption, traditions, and management aspects of hunting. Local resident hunters may hold exclusive rights to their hunting grounds or pay reasonable fees to gain access through permits or leases. They usually do not require the services of hunting tour operators. Most hunters fall into this category, although many can also be hunting tourists at some point in their lives.

Hunting tourism: Hunting tourism is conducted by hunters who may sometimes travel considerable distances from their home and/or own hunting grounds, and often abroad, in order to hunt. They may be well-acquainted with their destination and be familiar with the species they hunt. There is, however, a gradient in the degree to which travelling hunters may have socio-cultural links to their hunting destinations. The more exotic and unfamiliar a hunting destination is, the greater the socio-cultural barriers can be. In addition, motivation for hunting by such tourists may place greater emphasis on adventure and souvenirs (e.g. trophies) than is the case for hunters with closer links to the hunting destination. This can motivate payment of significant sums of money to intermediaries (“hunting tour operators”) that organise and facilitate their hunting experiences.

Sustainable hunting: The use of wild game species and their habitats in a way and at a rate that does not lead to the long-term decline of biodiversity or hinder its restoration. Such use maintains the potential of biodiversity to meet the needs and aspirations of present and future generations, as well as maintaining hunting itself as an accepted social, economic and cultural activity (based on the definition of “Sustainable Use” in Article 2 of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD)). When hunting is conducted in such a sustainable manner, it can positively contribute to the conservation of wild populations and their habitats and also benefit society.

Regulators: Government authorities at all levels with a responsibility for formulating, implementing and enforcing legislation and management policies pertaining to conservation and hunting.

Managers: Private or governmental agents, including landowners, who are responsible for the practical stewardship of wild species and their habitats.

Stakeholders: All those with an interest or share in the conservation and sustainable use of game, habitats and biodiversity. These include hunters, landowners, managers, conservationists, regulators, scientists and others with an interest in the conservation and use of biodiversity.

*Biological diversity*⁶: The variability among living organisms from all sources including *inter alia* terrestrial, marine and other aquatic ecosystems and the ecological complexes of which they are part; this includes diversity within species, between species and of ecosystems (Article 2 of the CBD).

*Ecosystem*⁷: A dynamic complex of plant, animal and micro-organism communities and their non-living environment interacting as a functional unit.

*Flyway*⁸: The biological systems of migration paths that directly link sites and ecosystems in different countries and continents.

⁵ See similar terminology in Leader-Williams, N., Sharp, R. & Wollscheid, K. (in press) in: *Recreational Hunting, Conservation and Rural Livelihoods: Science and Practice*. The Zoological Society of London. (<http://www.uicn.org/themes/ssc/susg/docs/workshopsummary.pdf>)

⁶ Derived from Article 2 of the CBD.

⁷ Derived from Article 2 of the CBD.

⁸ See [Boere](#), G.C. & Stroud D.A. 2006. The Flyway concept: what it is and what it isn't. pp. 40-47 in Boere, G.C., Galbraith, C.A. & Stroud, D.A. (eds). *Waterbirds around the world*. Edinburgh, The Stationary Office.

1.3 Scope

This Charter addresses hunting as a consumptive and recreational form of utilisation and/or management of species of birds and terrestrial mammals in Europe, in accordance with the provisions of the Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats (Bern, 1979).

1.4 Purpose

The main aim of the Bern Convention is the conservation of wildlife and its natural habitats. Hunters can contribute to the fulfilment of this aim through regulating game populations and caring for their habitats, assisting in monitoring and research, and raising public awareness for conservation issues. Thus, hunters and hunting play an important role in the conservation of biodiversity. This Charter provides a non-binding set of guidelines for hunters, hunting tour operators, regulators and managers that address common principles and good practices for sustainable hunting (including hunting tourism) in Europe. These principles and guidelines also aim to help fulfil the commitments of European States on conservation through use of components of biodiversity as laid down in the CBD, and as developed by the *Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines for the Sustainable Use of Biodiversity*⁹ (see Appendix 1) and the *Malawi Principles for the Ecosystem Approach*¹⁰ (see Appendix 2). Although the Principles and Guidelines in this Charter apply specifically to hunting, they are designed to have wider application regarding the consumptive use of biodiversity.

1.5 Goals

The Charter promotes principles and guidelines intended to ensure that hunting and hunting tourism in Europe are practiced in a sustainable manner, while avoiding negative impacts on biodiversity and making a positive contribution to the conservation of species and habitats and the needs of society.

1.6 Objectives

1.6.1 Sustainable hunting

The Charter:

- Provides a set of non-binding principles and guidelines for sustainable hunting (with firearms, bows, traps, hounds or birds of prey) to facilitate biodiversity conservation and rural development;
- Encourages hunter involvement in monitoring, management, and research efforts directed towards stewardship and the conservation of wildlife and their habitats;
- Promotes cooperation between hunters and other stakeholders in the conservation and management of biodiversity.

1.6.2 Hunting tourism

The Charter:

- Seeks to ensure that hunting tourism is sustainable;
- Promotes forms of hunting tourism that provide local communities with socio-economic incentives to conserve and manage wildlife and their habitats, as well as general biodiversity;
- Makes recommendations for hunting tour operators and hunters who engage their services.

1.6.3 Standards for European hunters

The Charter:

- Promotes measures that increase hunter proficiency and safety ;
- Encourages hunter education, awareness and information measures;
- Promotes best hunting practices.

⁹ <http://www.biodiv.org/doc/publications/addis-gdl-en.pdf>

¹⁰ <http://www.biodiv.org/doc/meetings/cop/cop-04/information/cop-04-inf-09-en.pdf>

2 CONTEXT

This section provides the context of international treaties, European policies, legal instruments, and other initiatives upon which the Principles and Guidelines of this Charter are based.

2.1 Sustainable Hunting

2.1.1 International agreements concerning sustainable use of wild living resources

Work in Europe regarding sustainable development must be viewed in a global context. The definition of sustainable development was formulated by the World Commission on Environment and Development Conference in 1987. It was endorsed under Agenda 21¹¹ at the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, which also launched the CBD. The objectives of the CBD are the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, and the fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising out of the utilisation of genetic resources. Sustainable use of the components of biological diversity is included in 13 of 19 substantive articles.

The IUCN developed a Sustainable Use Initiative in 1995 to enhance understanding of sustainable use and its contribution to conservation. This led to a Policy Statement adopted at its 2nd World Conservation Congress in 2000 which state, among other things, that: *“The use of wild living resources, if sustainable, is an important conservation tool because the social and economic benefits derived from such use provide incentives for people to conserve them”*. Also in 2000 the CBD initiated a process to produce principles of sustainable use through regional workshops in Mozambique, Vietnam and Ecuador and drawing on core material from an IUCN workshop at White Oak, Florida in 2001. These led to a synthesis workshop in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, after which the 7th CBD Conference of the Parties (COP) in 2004 adopted the resulting 14 Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines for the Sustainable Use of Biodiversity (AAPG)¹² on the understanding that they were to be seen as within the context of the Principles of the Ecosystem Approach (see below). AAPG were also formally recognised by CITES (the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora¹³) in 2004, at its 13th COP, and in 2005 adopted by the 3rd Meeting of Parties to the African-Eurasian Waterbird Agreement (AEWA).

The AAPG are based on the assumption that it is possible to use biodiversity in a manner in which ecological processes, species and genetic variability remain above the thresholds needed for long-term viability, and that all resource managers and users have the responsibility to ensure that such use does not exceed these. The AAPG emphasise the crucial need for the maintenance and/or recovery of biodiversity in ecosystems to ensure the long-term sustainability of ecological services upon which both biodiversity and people depend. Users and managers at all geographical and institutional levels are encouraged in the AAPG to adapt the cross-cutting principles and guidelines pragmatically to best fit local circumstances.

In an earlier process, a Workshop on the Ecosystem Approach held in Malawi during 1998 identified twelve principles for managing biodiversity at an ecosystem level, seeking to achieve a satisfactory balance between conservation and development. These *“Malawi principles”*¹⁴ were also adopted at the CBD 5th COP in 2000 (decision V/6)¹⁵. They advocate integrated management of land, water and living resources for promoting the conservation and sustainable use in an equitable way, recognising that humans and their diverse cultures are an integral part of ecosystems.

The Addis Ababa and Malawi principles can be summarised together as recommendations for:

1. Supportive and linked governance at all levels with harmonised regulations that promote societal benefits from conservation and avoid perverse effects.
2. Avoidance of adverse impacts within or between ecosystems and of short-termism, especially when faced with inevitable change.

¹¹ <http://www.un.org/esa/sustdev/documents/agenda21/index.htm>

¹² <http://www.biodiv.org/doc/publications/addis-gdl-en.pdf>

¹³ <http://www.cites.org/>

¹⁴ <http://www.cbd.int/doc/publications/ea-text-en.pdf> (see also Appendix 2).

¹⁵ <http://www.cbd.int/decisions/default.asp?lg=0&dec=V/6>

3. Transparent and adaptive management along a use-protection continuum, based on interdisciplinary science, monitoring and timely feedbacks.
4. Encouragement of economic/cultural incentives with sharing of benefits (and costs) especially at the local level, while avoiding waste.
5. Decentralisation of management to an appropriate bio-economic scale, especially to empower and hold accountable local people and access their knowledge.
6. Education, awareness and inclusion of managers, resource users, and society at large.

These broad principles include all 12 principles from Malawi (M) and 14 from Addis Ababa (A) grouped into social, ecological and economic focal areas, as 1) socio-cultural [M1,4,5, A1,3,8], 2) ecological [M3,5,8,9, A5], 3) socio-ecological [M10-12, A4,6], 4) economic [M1,4, A10-13], 5) bio-socio-economic [M2,7,11, A2,7,9] and 6) socio-cultural [M12, A14]. These 6 recommendations, containing the essence of the Ecosystem Approach and the Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines for Sustainable Use, provide a fundament for conserving biodiversity through hunting and other uses of wild resources (see Appendix 3).

2.1.2 The European context

The Bern Convention was signed in Switzerland in 1979 and came into force on 1 June 1982. It aims to conserve wild flora and fauna species within States, and emphasises the need for cooperation in the conservation of species and habitats across national borders, particularly endangered and vulnerable species (including migrants) and their habitats. Its 45 Contracting Parties committed themselves to enact appropriate legislation and administrative measures for the conservation of the indigenous species of fauna and flora and their habitats. The Bern Convention is the primary international treaty governing this sector in Europe, and provides the foundations for this Charter.

In the European Union (EU), there are two bodies of legislation that directly pertain to the conservation of wild species and their habitats and are of direct relevance for hunting in Europe. These are Council Directive 79/409/EEC of 2 April 1979 on the conservation of wild birds¹⁶ (aka the “Birds Directive”) and Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora¹⁷ (aka the “Habitats” or “FFH Directive”). Both of these directives recognise the role of sustainable hunting, while specifying limitations with regard to which species can be hunted.

2.1.3 Sustainable Hunting in Europe

Hunting is one of the oldest forms of consumptive use of renewable natural resources, and has always been an integral part of the cultures and traditions of European rural society. Today, there are over 7 million hunters in Europe¹⁸. They are mainly motivated by recreational, consumptive and / or social aspects, with regionally varying emphasis on these elements¹⁹. It is estimated that hunting provides the basis for over 120 000 jobs in Europe²⁰. Sustainably managed hunting can contribute to the conservation of biodiversity, the preservation of rural lifestyles and local economies. In this context hunting can provide strong incentives for conservation through use of biodiversity *sensu* CBD.

Since unsustainable hunting can have significant negative impacts on biodiversity and is therefore unacceptable, governance arrangements need to be in place to ensure that hunting in Europe is ecologically, socio-culturally, and economically sustainable. PACE, in Recommendation 1689 (2004) emphasised the need for sustainable hunting in Europe. Specifically, PACE stated its concern with “*changes made in recent years in central and east European countries concerning the liberalisation of hunting*”. The Recommendation goes on to say that “*if managed professionally and scientifically, the hunting tourism resulting from that liberalisation may prove to be a factor of development for rural*

¹⁶ http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/nature_conservation/eu_nature_legislation/birds_directive/index_en.htm

¹⁷ http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/nature_conservation/eu_nature_legislation/habitats_directive/index_en.htm

¹⁸ <http://www.face-europe.org/fs-hunting.htm>

¹⁹ http://www.face-europe.org/huntingineurope/Pinet%20Study/Pinet_study_EN.pdf

²⁰ <http://assembly.coe.int/Documents/AdoptedText/ta04/EREC1689.htm>

*and mountain regions. It may also make a significant contribution to rural tourism, ecotourism, job creation and the preservation of local traditions”*²¹.

Hunting can be regarded as a form of sustainable development, which is an overarching objective of the Treaty of the EU. The overall aim of the EU Sustainable Development Strategy, as renewed in 2006²², is “*to identify and develop actions to enable the EU to achieve continuous improvement of quality of life both for current and for future generations, through the creation of sustainable communities able to manage and use resources efficiently and to tap the ecological and social innovation potential of the economy, ensuring prosperity, environmental protection and social cohesion*”. Although hunting can use ecosystem services less intensively and more diversely than farming²³, there is a need to ensure that all forms of hunting, both by local residents and by tourists, are sustainable relative to ecological, economic, and socio-cultural considerations.

In 2001, the European Commission (EC) initiated its Sustainable Hunting Initiative (SHI) under the auspices of the Birds Directive with a view to developing cooperation between the primary organisations concerned with the conservation and wise, sustainable use of European wild birds. Ten measures with two main aims were suggested for consideration. These aims were 1) improvement of the legal and technical interpretation of the Bird Directive’s provisions relating to hunting, and 2) the development of a programme of scientific, conservation and training/awareness measures. These included the production of management plans for huntable species of unfavourable conservation status, as well as a ‘Charter on Sustainable Hunting’ within the framework of the Birds Directive. The success of this initiative has been dependent upon the commitment of a number of key stakeholders including the EC, the Member States, BirdLife International and FACE. The main fora for dialogue on implementation of the Birds Directive are the ORNIS Committee and its Scientific Working Group (SWG), in which both BirdLife International and FACE participate as observers.

A number of initiatives have resulted from the SHI. For example, the EC published non-binding guidelines on hunting pertaining to the Birds Directive in August 2004²⁴. By interpreting and explaining the provisions of the Directive and existing caselaw from the European Court of Justice, the guide elaborates the EC’s view on the setting of recreational hunting seasons, as well as other relevant issues pertaining to hunting. Its legal focus is primarily on huntable species listed in Annex II of the Directive as well as the relevant provisions of its Articles and the basis for exercising derogations by Member States. The guide not only deals with legal provisions but also covers scientific and technical dimensions given in the Birds Directive that are relevant to the conservation of wild birds.

In October of the same year, a bilateral agreement between FACE and BirdLife International, was signed in the presence of the EC Environment Commissioner²⁵. This agreement stresses the clear commitment of both organisations to the Birds Directive and their recognition of sustainable hunting, and identifies fields for future cooperation. The dialogue process between BirdLife and FACE has become a key element of the work towards sustainable bird hunting in Europe. Within this framework, both organisations promote dialogue and implementation of the agreement at the national level (e.g. an equivalent agreement has been signed between both organisations in Bulgaria). Both organisations also cooperate on the phasing out of lead-shot in wetlands, promoting the Natura 2000 network and addressing the issue of illegal hunting. A number of EU management plans for huntable species of unfavourable conservation status are in production, the first seven of which were approved by the ORNIS Committee in October 2006 and 2007²⁶.

Another SHI initiative, the European Hunting Bag Data Collection Programme ARTEMIS, was launched in June 2006 in Athens. The first objective of the ARTEMIS data bank is to centralise and analyse, in a coordinated and coherent manner, hunting bag information that has already been collected in many European countries.

²¹ <http://assembly.coe.int/Documents/AdoptedText/ta04/EREC1689.htm>

²² <http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/en/06/st10/st10117.en06.pdf>

²³ Kenward, R. E., & Garcia-Cidad, V. 2005. Innovative approaches to sustainable use of biodiversity and landscape in the farmed countryside. Pp 565-589 in UNEP High-Level Pan-European Conference on Agriculture and Biodiversity, Council of Europe, Strasbourg, France.

²⁴ [Guidance document on hunting under Council Directive 79/409/EEC on the conservation of wild birds](#)

²⁵ http://www.birdlife.org/news/news/2004/11/face_agreement.pdf

²⁶ http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/nature_conservation/focus_wild_birds/species_birds_directive/index_en.htm

The Federal Environment Agency of Austria established Guidelines for Sustainable Hunting²⁷ in 2001. These were later used as a basis for the Draft Guidelines for Sustainable Hunting in Europe²⁸ formulated by the Wild Species Resources Working Group (WISPER) of the IUCN-SSC ESUSG in September 2006. These WISPER guidelines aim to apply wider international principles and guidelines for the sustainable use of wild living resources at the European regional level. These guidelines apply to the recreational hunting of birds and mammals (with firearms, bows, traps, hounds or birds of prey), but are also applicable in other contexts, including subsistence hunting or commercial harvests.

Landowners are an important stakeholder group in the management of hunting and the conservation of biodiversity. The European Landowners Organisation ELO is one of the organisations responsible for the “*Pilot Wildlife Estates Initiative*” (PWEI²⁹). PWEI aims to establish within the framework of a sustainable development policy 1) simple principles of good management and conservation of wildlife estates all over Europe which can be adapted according to the different hunting methods of the various regions of the EU, and 2) a network of well-managed and exemplary estates. This initiative builds upon the concept of identifying exemplary estates, which will be studied in order to determine criteria and indicators on the basis of which it might be possible to create a “label”.

2.1.4 The Large Carnivore Initiative

Sustainable hunting is also recognised as an important and necessary tool for the conservation and management of large carnivores in Europe. The Core Group of the Large Carnivore Initiative for Europe (LCIE) presented its position paper on hunting and lethal control of large carnivores to the SC in 2002 (T-PVS/Inf (2002) 28)³⁰. LCIE has also provided the impetus for Action Plans under the Bern Convention for the five large carnivore species. LCIE believes that the hunting of large carnivores is acceptable under certain conditions and may benefit and be compatible with their conservation.

Primary among the conditions LCIE sets out in its position paper and species action plans is the need for a comprehensive management plan for each species. In order for hunting to be sustainable, it should only occur if a species population is regarded as demographically viable and proper consideration is given to its social organisation. Management plans must include goals for minimum population sizes as well as a plan for monitoring these goals through the active collection of biological data.

LCIE advocates transboundary population management using *inter alia* geographic differentiation (zoning) where applicable. Geographically differentiated management is based upon the varied use of management tools in different areas, whereby species may receive a higher or lower level of protection in management units depending upon certain criteria (overall population goals, level of conflict with local inhabitants, etc.). An extreme situation is complete protection of large carnivores in some areas, and their complete exclusion from other areas. However, in many cases a more advanced approach may be used, whereby management units have different population goals and management regimes. Hunting can be used as a tool in this context for regulating populations relative to predetermined management goals.

LCIE also states that hunting methods must be in accordance with international, national or regional laws and killing should be carried out humanely. They further emphasise the need for specific training of hunters that hunt large carnivores. In Norway, an advisory group of stakeholders and researchers presented a report that has influenced large carnivore policy formation in that country³¹. The report reflects many of the principles espoused by the LCIE, and emphasises the need for involvement of local hunters in the management of large carnivore populations in that country.

²⁷ www.biodiv.at/chm/jagd

²⁸ www.iucn.org/themes/ssc/susg/docs/WISPERguidelines210906_1.pdf

²⁹ http://www.elo.org/assets/documents/files/Sustainable_Hunting.pdf

³⁰ <http://www.lcie.org/Docs/LCIE%20IUCN/COE%20LCIE%20position%20statement%20on%20LC%20hunting%202002.pdf>

³¹ http://www.nina.no/archive/nina/PppBasePdf/temahefte/2003/25_eng.pdf

2.2 Hunting tourism

Hunting is practiced in Europe not only by resident hunters, but also by hunters travelling from abroad. Hunting tourists are generally willing to pay more for these experiences than resident hunters and may employ the services of a hunting tour operator (guide or outfitter). In any event, such activity is to be regarded as a form of nature tourism, and is thus a part of the broader tourism market. According to the UN World Tourism Organization, tourists are people who "travel to and stay in places outside their usual environment for not more than one consecutive year for leisure, business and other purposes not related to the exercise of an activity remunerated from within the place visited"³². In its programme on Biodiversity and Tourism Development, CBD notes that in some respects hunting tourism, if well regulated, may be comparable to eco-tourism. In relation to the need for regulation, CBD suggests development of standards within a regionally-appropriate approach to the issue.³³

Hunting tourism can be viewed as a subcategory of both hunting and tourism. It can provide important economic benefits to rural areas, in addition to ecological and socio-cultural values, as recognised by the PACE Resolution 882 (1987) "On the importance of shooting for Europe's rural regions"³⁴. The CIC points out that since it is a form of tourism³⁵, this type of hunting is influenced by a number of market factors. Although hunting may be the primary goal of a tourist trip, there are other elements involved, including transportation and local mobility, food and accommodation, services and goods, as well as other activities at the destination³⁶.

2.2.1 European hunting tourism

According to a report published in 2002 by TRAFFIC on Trophy Hunting and Conservation in Eurasia³⁷, as many as 20 - 30% of the European hunters (from the EU as well as Norway and Switzerland) may travel outside their home country for hunting at one time or another. This would represent about 1.3 million European hunters, of which a smaller proportion would hunt abroad in a given year. Germany, Austria, Denmark, the Benelux countries, Italy, and Spain are the main European demand countries. The most popular destination countries for hunting tourism are Hungary, Poland and other Eastern European countries. Scandinavia is also an attractive destination for hunters from other parts of Europe, while many Scandinavians also hunt abroad. TRAFFIC estimates that about 1/3 of total expenditures by European hunting tourists, which amounts to about €40 - 50 million annually, remains within destination countries.

2.2.2 International regulation of wildlife trade

Since travelling hunters transport hunting souvenirs or trophies back to their home countries, this activity is directly monitored and regulated by international law. CITES evolved through the need to ensure that international trade in specimens of wild animals and plants is properly regulated and does not threaten their survival. It was launched in 1973 when representatives of 80 countries met in Washington D.C., USA, now has more than 170 signatory states and applies to some 30,000 species of animal and plant worldwide. Signatory States (Parties) are legally obligated to implement the CITES framework by adapting their national laws and regulations to it.

CITES Appendices I, II and III afford listed species different levels or types of protection from over-exploitation. Appendix I prohibits international trade for the most endangered species, except

³² <http://www.unwto.org/>

³³ Wollscheid, K. 2005. Multilateral environmental agreements and the future of hunting. In: M.M.R. Freeman, R.J. Hudson and L.Foote (editors), Conservation Hunting: People and Wildlife in Canada's North. Canadian Circumpolar Institute Press, Occasional Publication 56, Edmonton, pp. 57-64.

³⁴ <http://assembly.coe.int/Main.asp?link=/Documents/AdoptedText/ta87/ERES882.htm>

³⁵ http://www.cic-wildlife.org/uploads/media/Strasdas_Tourismus_in_der_Technisch_in_Technicat_Co-operation_1999_eng.pdf

³⁶ Sharp, R. & Wollscheid, K. (in press) Recreational Hunting –an Overview: what it consists of and who does it. In: Recreational Hunting, Conservation and Rural Livelihoods: Science and Practice, IUCN.

³⁷ Hofer, D. (2002) *The Lion's Share of the Hunt. Trophy Hunting and Conservation-A review of the legal Eurasian tourist hunting market and trophy trade under CITES.* TRAFFIC Europe. <http://www.traffic.org/content/546.pdf>

when the purpose of the import is not commercial, for instance for scientific research. Appendix II lists species that are not presently threatened with extinction but that may become so unless trade is closely controlled. It also includes so-called "*look-alike species*", i.e. species of which the specimens in trade look like those of species listed for conservation reasons. Appendix III is a list of species included at the request of a Party that already regulates trade in the species and that needs the cooperation of other countries to prevent unsustainable or illegal exploitation.

The Wildlife Trade Regulation (Council Regulation (EC) No. 338/97³⁸) directly transposes the provisions of CITES in the EU. This Regulation is in many ways stricter than CITES³⁹, for example through an Annex A that prohibits commercial trade in species not otherwise listed by CITES (e.g. several large carnivores that are important for hunters⁴⁰ and all birds of prey). The EU also adds an Annex D, of species for which import levels are monitored.

2.2.3 Sustainable Hunting Tourism

The CIC has initiated a global programme to develop principles and define indicators for sustainable hunting tourism (SHT) in accordance with existing international sustainability concepts⁴¹. The SHT holds the vision that sustainable hunting tourism "*contributes to the conservation of wildlife and its habitats, benefits local livelihoods and also secures hunting*". The SHT, based on a wide stakeholder approach, aims to provide a set of practical principles, guidelines and criteria that translate the AAPG into the needs of the hunting tourism sector at regional, national and international levels. First project areas for testing the applicability of the principles and developing criteria and indicators are South Africa, Central Asia and Scandinavia.

The ministerial conference "*Environment for Europe*", held in Lucerne in 1993, called upon the CoE to promote ecologically viable tourism. In September 1994, the CM adopted Recommendation No. R (94) on a general policy for sustainable and environmentally friendly tourism development⁴². This recommendation embraced the principles of sustainability as set out by the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development⁴³ in 1992, and formulated principles for management authorities to ensure the sustainability of tourism in Europe. In 2003, the EC reported on basic orientations for the sustainability of European tourism⁴⁴, which lead to the formation of the Tourism Sustainability Group (TSG) in 2004. In February 2007, the TSG produced a report that outlines a plan of action for ensuring the sustainability of tourism in Europe⁴⁵.

If managed properly, hunting tourism can provide incentives for local communities to conserve wildlife and their habitats. If practiced improperly, however, hunting tourism can have negative impacts on wildlife, both directly and indirectly, particularly if there is little support for or direct benefit to local communities⁴⁶. In some cases, direct conflicts can also arise between local hunters and non-resident hunters. It is therefore important that hunting tourism, as a specialised form of hunting and tourism, is ecologically, economically and socially sustainable. The TRAFFIC report makes specific recommendations regarding the integration of hunting tourism with Eurasian conservation initiatives. It places emphasis on a case-by-case approach to evaluate criteria needed to optimise benefits for conservation and ensure sustainability. It also suggests that avenues for effective marketing of conservation-oriented hunting should be explored. It encourages dialogue between different stakeholders involved in hunting tourism in order to promote conservation issues. It suggests that a

³⁸ See http://ec.europa.eu/environment/cites/legislation_en.htm

³⁹ Theile, S., Steiner, A. and Kecse-Nagy, K. (2004). *Expanding borders: New challenges for wildlife trade controls in the European Union*. TRAFFIC Europe, Brussels, Belgium.

⁴⁰ Kecse-Nagy, K., Papp, D. Knapp, A., von Meibom, S. (2006). *Wildlife trade in Central and Eastern Europe. A review of CITES implementation in 15 countries*. TRAFFIC Europe report, Budapest, Hungary

⁴¹ <http://www.cic-wildlife.org/index.php?id=176>

⁴² <https://wcd.coe.int/com.instranet.InstraServlet?Command=com.instranet.CmdBlobGet&DocId=513072&SecM ode=1&Admin=0&Usage=4&IntranetImage=43334>

⁴³ <http://www.un.org/documents/ga/conf151/aconf15126-1annex1.htm>

⁴⁴ COM(2003) 716

⁴⁵ http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/services/tourism/doc/tsg/TSG_Final_Report.pdf

⁴⁶ <http://www.traffic.org/content/546.pdf>

certification process may be an effective long-term instrument for reducing unacceptable practices by promoting qualified hunting tour operators.

2.3 Standards for European hunters

For hunting to contribute positively to the conservation of biodiversity, it needs to be perceived as sustainable by society in all ways - ecologically, economically, and socio-culturally. Standards for European hunters must reflect the demands of greater society in this context at all levels – locally, regionally, nationally and internationally. Such standards must address the particular need for socio-cultural sustainability, which implies that hunters should be perceived by society as being proficient and conscientious. Proficient hunters must demonstrate the safe and proper handling of the tools they use with regard to public safety and the ethical harvest of game. Hunters must also know and respect game laws and regulations as well as the rights and obligations of other rural stakeholders. A proficient hunter also understands basic game biology and species identification, and knows how to efficiently dispatch game with a minimum of stress and suffering. As stewards of the wildlife resource, hunters should also possess basic knowledge regarding game and habitat management principles and techniques. A conscientious hunter is aware of the potential impacts hunting can have on wildlife, and should strive to hunt in ways that are biologically and socially sustainable. Likewise, hunters should recognise a duty of care for wildlife and their habitats, and embrace partnerships with other conservation interests where possible to further such efforts. Hunters should also work together to improve methods that ensure that avoidable animal suffering is minimised. It is also important that hunters and other conservation interests engage in dialogue regarding each other's activities to ensure mutual respect and understanding.

2.3.1 European policy regarding hunter standards

The subject of hunter proficiency and conduct was first addressed over twenty years ago by the CM in its Recommendation No. R (85) 17⁴⁷. This document recognised the importance of hunting as a tool in wildlife management, *“provided that it respects the ecological needs of species and the requirements of biological equilibria”*. It also noted that certain practices may produce harmful effects, and emphasised the need for the training of hunters to *“make them more aware of their responsibilities towards the natural heritage”*. The recommendation called upon the governments of Member States to consider requiring hunters to pass a proficiency exam before they are allowed to hunt, and suggested a syllabus for such an examination. It further advised member states to cooperate with relevant organisations in hunter education and training, as well as devising a code of conduct for hunters based upon a set of recommendations.

European countries generally have some form of hunter education and training programme, often as a cooperative effort between government authorities and hunter organisations at national or regional levels. Requirements vary from country to country and can be very stringent. However, some countries, including certain EU Member States, do not require any formalised training or exam. A summary review within Europe would be useful in order to gain a better overview regarding the degree to which hunters are required to meet formal standards for proficiency and conduct in each country, and what tangible results have been achieved.

In addition, many national hunter organisations (e.g. French Federation of Hunters⁴⁸, the Hunters' Central Organization in Finland⁴⁹, and the Nordic Hunter Congress⁵⁰) have adopted codes or rules of ethical conduct similar to those given in CM Recommendation No. R (85) 17. These rules of behaviour intend to foster hunting ethics as a form of self-regulation above and beyond codified legislation. They place much emphasis on hunter responsibility towards wildlife and nature as well as towards other users of the countryside, and encourage active participation in the management and conservation of populations and their habitats. They also aim to foster awareness regarding the obligations and responsibilities hunters have to other members of society, and underline the need for high standards of

⁴⁷ <https://wcd.coe.int/com.instranet.InstraServlet?Command=com.instranet.CmdBlobGet&DocId=687208&SecM ode=1&Admin=0&Usage=4&InstranetImage=45259>

⁴⁸ Charte des Chasseurs de France, La Fédération nationale des chasseurs (2002)

⁴⁹ http://onet.tehonetti.fi/riista3/onet/data/attachments/jag0604_Eettiset.pdf

⁵⁰ Code of conduct (Adopted by the 1972 Nordic Hunter Congress)

conduct which can earn the respect of those that do not hunt. Such codes of conduct are, in reality, guidelines for the sustainability of hunting through its acceptance by general society.

2.4 Conclusion

Existing global and European policies and rules address many central tenets with relevance to hunting in Europe. Sustainable use is internationally recognised as a significant tool for the management and conservation of biodiversity. Hunting must therefore be ecologically, economically and socio-culturally sustainable to ensure its long-term viability. The next chapter presents principles and guidelines for sustainable hunting in the management and conservation of biodiversity. They are to be treated as facilitative and not prescriptive.

3 EUROPEAN CHARTER ON HUNTING AND BIODIVERSITY

3.1 Principle 1: Favour multi-level governance that maximises benefit for conservation and society

3.1.1 Rationale:

Human decisions that change land-use and affect species are influenced by regulatory and financial incentives at several levels, as well as by cultural and social factors. Policies affecting these factors need to be established at the most appropriate geographical level and to remain flexible, in order to accommodate different biological, economic and social conditions as well as adaptive management. Increasing uniformity of culture and markets creates special regulatory challenges in guiding local use of land and wild living resources to retain diverse ecological conditions.

3.1.2 Guidelines:

Conservation will be enhanced if

3.1.2.1 Regulators and managers:

- a) Take into consideration the international, national, regional and local – as appropriate - conservation status of fauna and flora;
- b) Encourage the creation of policies and structures that reduce conflicts and create synergies between hunting and other conservation interests, reward best practices (e.g. with subsidies or privileges), and regulate against malpractice;
- c) Ensure that the policies and structures accommodate local cultural demands (i.e. multiple use) and ecological conditions as well as higher-level policy;
- d) Audit for regulatory or other incentives that are detrimental for conservation of biodiversity, and remove, neutralise or compensate for them.

- and -

3.1.2.2 Hunters and hunting tour operators:

- a) Assist authorities at all levels to develop and promote incentives for conserving biodiversity through sustainable use;
- b) Strive at all levels to attain maximum conservation benefit through hunting.

3.2 Principle 2: Ensure that regulations are understandable and respected

3.2.1 Rationale:

Regulations are important and necessary, but can have costs for conservation as well as for stakeholders. Costs are least when minimal administration is combined with maximum motivation to comply. Thus, compliance should be easy to achieve and non-compliance should be reliably detectable. Inappropriate (including incomprehensible or non-applicable) regulations may induce negative effects (e.g. illegal killing) if non-compliance is simple and rewarding, or if the rationale behind these is not understood.

3.2.2 Guidelines:

Conservation will be enhanced if

3.2.2.1 Regulators and managers:

- a) Formulate simple, flexible, and logical regulations which address biological principles, (inter)national policy, the socio-economic context, as well as reasonable stakeholder concerns and expectations;
- b) Impose only those restrictions on methods and means which can be justified from the standpoint of conservation and that will be easily understood by stakeholders;
- c) Have transparent regulatory processes that allow for the active participation of hunters and other stakeholders;
- d) Favour forensic law enforcement technologies that motivate minimal-effort compliance;
- e) Create regulations that can be adapted to local governance and enforcement needs.

- and -

3.2.2.2 Hunters and hunting tour operators:

- a) Assist in development and acceptance of effective regulations;
- b) Follow and encourage respect for all rules and regulations pertaining to hunting, conservation measures (including protected areas), and private property;
- c) Embrace self-regulation where possible;
- d) Assist in preventing and reporting poaching.

3.3 Principle 3: Ensure that harvest is ecologically sustainable

3.3.1 Rationale:

It is important to ensure that any harvest of wild populations is sustainable. The conservation status of species needs to be maintained at levels which are robust enough to sustain harvest. In some cases, limited and sustainable hunting of small populations may also serve to enhance conservation efforts on their behalf. Sustainable use requires regulation based upon the active use of reliable science and local knowledge.

3.3.2 Guidelines:

Conservation will be enhanced if

3.3.2.1 Regulators and managers:

- a) Implement adaptive management strategies for sustainable harvest and maintaining populations at optimal levels relative to ecological and socio-economic carrying capacity and objectives;
- b) Ensure that management plans and/or measures have clear objectives that take into account the behaviour and ecology (including predation and seasonal effects) and the long-term conservation status of wild species. These plans and/or measures should also consider the possible effects of harvest strategies and other measures on ecosystems, species populations and society. Management plans and/or measures need provisions to ensure proper implementation, monitoring and updating.
- c) Seek to avoid and mitigate negative impacts on species and/or habitats where possible, and optimise management of ecosystem components to the benefit of biodiversity and society;
- d) Ensure that harvest by resident hunters and hunting tourists is addressed in management plans;
- e) Cooperate with hunters to develop and apply methods for simple and effective monitoring and management of populations, habitats and ecosystem services;
- f) Cooperate with neighbouring and flyway administrative authorities to properly manage and conserve transboundary populations where appropriate;

- g) Develop and implement standardised systems for collecting harvest data for use in adaptive management of populations at all appropriate scales;
- h) Recognise that natural and human-induced change is inevitable.

- and -

3.3.2.2 Hunters and hunting tour operators:

- a) Assist in population monitoring and research;
- b) Work to integrate their activities into the adaptive management of populations and habitats of target game species;
- c) Understand and recognise the biological role and impact of indigenous predators on game species and take this into account when participating in their conservation and management;
- d) Ensure that populations of target game species are kept at optimal levels relative to their habitats, species communities and any biodiversity restoration targets;
- e) Ensure that harvests are demographically sustainable and non-detrimental to ecosystem services.

3.4 Principle 4: Maintain wild populations of indigenous species with adaptive gene pools

3.4.1 Rationale:

Native species and their habitats, as well as human livelihoods derived from them, can be adversely impacted by either the introduction of invasive alien species, or human selection for traits which may jeopardise the long-term viability of their populations.

3.4.2 Guidelines:

Conservation will be enhanced if

3.4.2.1 Regulators and managers:

- a) Deter the release of new alien species that could become invasive and/or negatively effect native fauna or flora;
- b) Engage hunters in programmes to remove invasive alien species;
- c) Facilitate the reestablishment of originally indigenous species of fauna and flora in accordance with IUCN guidelines⁵¹ and have clear management plans that define their recovery;
- d) Incorporate genetic considerations into management plans;
- e) Seek transboundary cooperation to ensure genetic adaptability of populations;
- f) Monitor the genetic characteristics of species populations of special concern.

- and -

3.4.2.2 Hunters and hunting tour operators:

- a) Accept the return through natural recolonisation of wild species that were once indigenous to an area, taking into account the socio-economic context;
- b) Favour re-stocking from appropriate sources but only introduce or reintroduce species in accordance with IUCN guidelines;
- c) Avoid exclusive selection for specific phenotypic or behavioural traits of individuals which are not representative of the wild species population and can consequently be detrimental;
- d) Aid scientists and managers in monitoring genetic characteristics of populations.

⁵¹ IUCN/SSC Guidelines For Re-Introductions: <http://www.iucn.org/themes/ssc/publications/policy/reinte.htm>

3.5 Principle 5: Maintain environments that support healthy and robust populations of harvestable species

3.5.1 Rationale:

Wildlife species are vulnerable to pollutants and other human impacts on their populations and habitats. It is therefore in the interest of all who enjoy or benefit from wildlife to work together to reduce or mitigate the effects of environmental degradation. There is a need for the continued monitoring of the condition of harvested animals and their habitats.

3.5.2 Guidelines:

Conservation will be enhanced if

3.5.2.1 Regulators and managers:

- a) Develop mutually agreed systems that motivate hunters to help conserve habitats and landscapes with their associated fauna;
- b) Develop and implement standardised systems for monitoring the health and condition of game animals, populations, habitats and ecosystems;
- c) Account for possible negative impacts of hunting on other ecosystem services and minimise and mitigate these.

- and -

3.5.2.2 Hunters and hunting tour operators:

- a) Actively contribute to the conservation and restoration of habitats at appropriate scales where feasible;
- b) Work to ensure that their activities do not adversely impact local environments and habitats;
- c) Use only native flora for habitat restoration.

3.6 Principle 6: Encourage use to provide economic incentives for conservation

3.6.1 Rationale:

Stakeholders can be motivated to conserve wild species and their habitats by recognising their inherent economic value.

3.6.2 Guidelines:

Conservation will be enhanced if

3.6.2.1 Regulators and managers:

- a) Understand that suppliers of harvest opportunities expect fair compensation for the services and opportunities they provide;
- b) Encourage harvest models that provide socio-economic benefits to local stakeholders and communities;
- c) Set official fees or taxes at reasonable levels so that these do not represent barriers to local participation;
- d) Provide local stakeholders and communities with incentives to uphold or improve the diversity of species and habitats.

- and -

3.6.2.2 Hunters:

- a) Are willing to make reasonable contributions for access and hunting opportunity, as well as the conservation and management of game and their habitats;
- b) Accept contributory and management structures that favour a fair and appropriate balance for access between resident and non-resident hunters.

- and -

3.6.2.3 Hunting tour operators:

- a) Acknowledge and accept that their activities should benefit local economies and stakeholders and thereby enhance conservation efforts;
- b) Accept that their access can be limited, and/or that they can be subjected to higher fees than local resident hunters.

3.7 Principle 7: Ensure that harvest is properly utilised and wastage avoided

3.7.1 Rationale:

Utilising a renewable resource to the fullest possible extent will maximise the economic incentives for local people as well as indicate respect for the environment and in some cases minimise bio-pollution.

3.7.2 Guidelines:

Conservation will be enhanced if

3.7.2.1 Regulators and managers:

- a) Encourage the proper handling and processing of harvested wildlife;
- b) Ensure that game products comply with standards for health and hygiene before sale and/ or commercial consumption.

- and -

3.7.2.2 Hunters and hunting tour operators:

- a) Properly care for meat in order to prevent wastage and contamination;
- b) Fully utilise fur and hides where possible;
- c) Utilise harvested wildlife in other ways where possible and desirable;
- d) Observe rules of proper hygiene to ensure game meat quality and guard against detrimental health effects for consumers;
- e) Ensure that unutilised game products are made available to local inhabitants.

3.8 Principle 8: Empower local stakeholders and hold them accountable

3.8.1 Rationale:

With good local knowledge and monitoring, management at local level is most rapidly adaptive. It also both empowers stakeholders and holds them immediately accountable for meeting requirements of resource beneficiaries and conservation. Local management must be in harmony with higher level goals.

3.8.2 Guidelines:

Conservation will be enhanced if

3.8.2.1 Regulators and managers:

- a) Where appropriate, promote and facilitate decentralised management of species with healthy populations that are stable or increasing at local or regional levels;
- b) Facilitate the empowerment and accountability of local stakeholders, especially hunters, in this decentralised process;
- c) Promote models that ensure equitable sharing of benefits among user groups.

- and -

3.8.2.2 Hunters:

- a) Have knowledge regarding wildlife ecology and conservation practices;
- b) Recognise their role as resource stewards and actively participate in practical management and conservation measures;
- c) Interact with other interests and local authorities to find the best solutions.

- and -

3.8.2.3 Hunting tour operators:

- a) Recognise the cultures, traditions and needs of local people (including hunters);
- b) Work closely with local hunters, managers, and other stakeholders to ensure integration of activities and avoid conflicts.

3.9 Principle 9: Competence and responsibility are desirable among users of wild resources

3.9.1 Rationale:

For practices to be ecologically and socially sustainable, those using wild resources are advised to be responsible and proficient regarding methods, equipment and species they utilise.

3.9.2 Guidelines:

Conservation will be enhanced if

3.9.2.1 Regulators and managers:

- a) Encourage and facilitate education and training programmes for hunters;
- b) Cooperate with organisations that coordinate hunters to engage with all participants, including recruitment from both sexes, all ages and backgrounds.

- and -

3.9.2.2 Hunters:

- a) Are proficient in the proper and safe handling and use of tools and implements that can legally be used for hunting;
- b) Have sufficient knowledge on the identification, habits and ecology of game species as well as of non-game species;
- c) Train regularly to maintain or improve proficiency;
- d) Know the laws and regulations governing hunting and the conservation of wildlife where they hunt;
- e) Teach new hunters the skills and knowledge they require to be competent and responsible.

- and -

3.9.2.3 Hunting tour operators:

- a) Provide their clients with the information and knowledge they need for a sustainable and responsible hunt.

3.10 Principle 10: Minimise avoidable suffering by animals

3.10.1 Rationale:

For practices to be socially sustainable, avoidable suffering needs to be minimised.

3.10.2 Guidelines:

Conservation will be enhanced if

3.10.2.1 Regulators and managers:

- a) Adopt rules, regulations and incentives that promote methods and equipment that minimise avoidable suffering for animals;
- b) Communicate to hunters the need to treat game animals with respect;
- c) Recognise and promote best practices.

- and -

3.10.2.2 Hunters and hunting tour operators:

- a) Show respect for game animals and strive to reduce or eliminate avoidable suffering where possible;
- b) Learn about animal physiology and the most efficient way to kill game while inflicting minimal suffering;
- c) Promote measures which ensure proficiency in the use of hunting techniques and implements;
- d) Strive to efficiently track down and dispatch wounded game;
- e) Do not use capture methods that cause high levels of stress or pain, and/or are unselective or involve mass-capture;
- f) Take care not to disturb species in ways that can have significant and detrimental impacts.

3.11 Principle 11: Encourage cooperation between all stakeholders in management of harvested species, associated species and their habitats

3.11.1 Rationale:

All stakeholders, including authorities, state agencies, landowners, hunters, other resource users and conservation interests, can contribute positively to the proper management of biodiversity through cooperation. Such cooperation promotes a synergistic role for sustainable use in broad conservation efforts whereas conflicts waste human resources.

3.11.2 Guidelines:

Conservation will be enhanced if

3.11.2.1 Regulators and managers:

- a) Create institutional structures that are inclusive of all stakeholder interests;
- b) Encourage public understanding of conservation, economic, and/or cultural benefits which can be derived from responsible and sustainable harvest;
- c) Seek opportunities and provide incentives for cooperation between different interests;
- d) Use all possible measures to avoid and resolve conflicts.

- and -

3.11.2.2 Hunters and hunting tour operators:

- a) Seek opportunities to benefit human and wildlife populations (including non-game species) and their habitats;
- b) Actively seek alliances with other local stakeholders.

3.12 Principle 12: Encourage acceptance by society of sustainable, consumptive use as a conservation tool

3.12.1 Rationale:

Given the broadly common aspiration of hunters and other conservationists for there to be healthy wildlife populations, and given the great threats much biodiversity in Europe faces through land use

change and other anthropogenic factors, it is essential that all stakeholders work together to educate the public regarding the importance of wildlife conservation. In order to ensure acceptance by society, it is important that all users of wildlife communicate to the public the benefits sustainable use has for biodiversity conservation. It is also essential that all stakeholders to work together to educate the public regarding important conservation issues.

3.12.2 Guidelines:

Conservation will be enhanced if

3.12.2.1 Regulators and managers:

- a) Provide a framework which ensures the long-term acceptance by society of the conservation benefits derived from harvesting wild species;
- b) Ensure that populations of game species are kept at levels that are compatible with the interests of other socio-economic sectors (e.g. agriculture, forestry, etc.);
- c) Preserve legitimate cultural, historical and aesthetic values related to wildlife and hunting.

- and –

3.12.2.2 Hunters and hunting tour operators:

- a) Are sensitive and respectful to local interests and cultures;
- b) Strive to be ambassadors for hunting through proper behaviour and practices;
- c) Respect private property and local restrictions, including conservation measures;
- d) Educate and inform other interests about the benefits of sustainable hunting and conservation;
- e) Understand the need for local involvement in all hunting activity, including hunting tourism operations.

4. APPENDICES

4.1 Appendix 1. Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines for the Sustainable Use of Biodiversity⁵²

Sustainable use of biodiversity components will be enhanced if the following practical principles and related operational guidelines are applied:

<u>Practical principle 1</u>	Supportive policies, laws, and institutions are in place at all levels of governance and there are effective linkages between these levels.
<u>Practical principle 2</u>	Recognising the need for a governing framework consistent with international(1) national laws, local users of biodiversity components should be sufficiently empowered and supported by rights to be responsible and accountable for use of the resources concerned.
<u>Practical principle 3</u>	International, national policies, laws and regulations that distort markets which contribute to habitat degradation or otherwise generate perverse incentives that undermine conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, should be identified and removed or mitigated.
<u>Practical principle 4</u>	Adaptive management should be practiced, based on: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Science and traditional and local knowledge; 2. Iterative, timely and transparent feedback derived from monitoring the use, environmental, socio-economic impacts, and the status of the resource being used; and 3. Adjusting management based on timely feedback from the monitoring procedures.
<u>Practical principle 5</u>	Sustainable use management goals and practices should avoid or minimise adverse impacts on ecosystem services, structure and functions as well as other components of ecosystems.
<u>Practical principle 6</u>	Interdisciplinary research into all aspects of the use and conservation of biological diversity should be promoted and supported.
<u>Practical principle 7</u>	The spatial and temporal scale of management should be compatible with the ecological and socio-economic scales of the use and its impact.
<u>Practical principle 8</u>	There should be arrangements for international cooperation where multinational decision-making and coordination are needed.
<u>Practical principle 9</u>	An interdisciplinary, participatory approach should be applied at the appropriate levels of management and governance related to the use.
<u>Practical principle 10</u>	International, national policies should take into account: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Current and potential values derived from the use of biological diversity; 2. Intrinsic and other non-economic values of biological diversity and 3. Market forces affecting the values and use.
<u>Practical principle 11</u>	Users of biodiversity components should seek to minimise waste and adverse environmental impact and optimise benefits from uses.
<u>Practical principle 12</u>	The needs of indigenous and local communities who live with and are affected by the use and conservation of biological diversity, along with their contributions to its conservation and sustainable use, should be reflected in the equitable distribution of the benefits from the use of those resources.
<u>Practical principle 13</u>	The costs of management and conservation of biological diversity should be internalised within the area of management and reflected in the distribution of the benefits from the use.
<u>Practical principle 14</u>	Education and public awareness programmes on conservation and sustainable use should be implemented and more effective methods of communications should be developed between and among stakeholders and managers.

⁵² <http://www.biodiv.org/programmes/socio-eco/use/addis-principles.asp#1>

4.2 Appendix 2. Malawi Principles of the Ecosystem Approach⁵³

1. *The objectives of management of land, water and living resources are a matter of societal choice.*
2. *Management should be decentralized to the lowest appropriate level.*
3. *Ecosystem managers should consider the effects (actual or potential) of their activities on adjacent and other ecosystems.*
4. *Recognizing potential gains from management there is usually a need to understand and manage the ecosystem in an economic context. Any such ecosystem-management programme should:*
 - (a) *Reduce those market distortions that adversely affect biological diversity;*
 - (b) *Align incentives to promote biodiversity conservation and sustainable use;*
 - (c) *Internalize costs and benefits in the given ecosystem to the extent feasible.*
5. *Conservation of ecosystem structure and functioning, in order to maintain ecosystem services, should be a priority target of the ecosystem approach.*
6. *Ecosystems must be managed within the limits of their functioning.*
7. *The ecosystem approach should be undertaken at the appropriate spatial and temporal scales.*
8. *Recognizing the varying temporal scales and lag-effects that characterize ecosystem processes, objectives for ecosystem management should be set for the long term.*
9. *Management must recognize that change is inevitable.*
10. *The ecosystem approach should seek the appropriate balance between, and integration of, conservation and use of biological diversity.*
11. *The ecosystem approach should consider all forms of relevant information, including scientific and indigenous and local knowledge, innovations and practices.*
12. *The ecosystem approach should involve all relevant sectors of society and scientific disciplines.*

⁵³ <http://www.biodiv.org/doc/meetings/cop/cop-04/information/cop-04-inf-09-en.pdf>

4.3 Appendix 3. Relationship between Hunting Charter and AAPG/Malawi Principles.

Three pillars of sustainability	Addis Ababa/ Malawi	Focus	Number	Principles in this Charter	AAPG/ MALAWI MAP
Socio-cultural	Supportive & linked governance at all levels with harmonised regulations that promote societal benefits from conservation and avoid perverse effects.	General	1	Favour multi-level governance that maximises benefit for conservation and society.	(A1,A3,M2, M4)
		Regulatory	2	Ensure that regulations are understandable and respected.	(A1,A8,A13, M10)
Ecological	Avoidance of adverse impacts within or between ecosystems, and of short-termism, especially when faced with inevitable change. Transparent and adaptive management along a use-protection continuum, based on interdisciplinary science, monitoring and timely feedbacks.	Demographic	3	Ensure that harvest is ecologically sustainable	(A4,A6,A9, M7-12)
		Genetics	4	Maintain wild populations of indigenous species with adaptive gene pools	(A5,A9, M11-12)
		Ecosystem services	5	Maintain environments that support healthy and robust populations of harvestable species.	(A4,A6,A9, M7-12)
Economic	Encouragement of economic/cultural incentives with sharing of benefits (and costs) especially at local level, while avoiding waste.	Economic incentives	6	Encourage use to provide economic incentives for conservation	(A4,M10)
		Waste avoidance	7	Ensure that harvest is properly utilised and wastage avoided.	(A11)
Socio-cultural, Ecological, Economic	Decentralisation of management to an appropriate bio-economic scale, especially to empower, assess and access knowledge of local users.	Local management	8	Empower local stakeholders and hold them accountable.	(A2,A4,A9-10,A12-13, M2,M4,M7, M11-12)
Socio-cultural	Education, awareness and inclusion of managers, resource users and society at large.	Conduct and proficiency of harvesters	9	Competence and responsibility are desirable among wild resource users	(A11)
		Animal welfare	10	Minimise avoidable suffering by animals.	(A14,M1, M12)
		Horizontal trust	11	Encourage cooperation between all stakeholders in management of harvested species, associated species and their habitats.	(A2,A9,A14, M1,M12)
		Social acceptance	12	Encourage acceptance of sustainable and consumptive use as a conservation tool by the public and other conservation interests.	(A12, M14)