UNIVERSITY OF THE FREE STATE
UNIVERSITEIT VAN DIE VRYSTAAT
YUNIVESITHI YA FREISTATA

UFS NATURAL AND AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES
PREDATION MANAGEMENT CENTRE (PMC)

Predation management in South Africa – historical milestones

Conceptualised, collated and compiled by

HO de Waal

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

ALPRU - Occasional Paper, 23 July 2021

[Version 5.0]

Predation management in South Africa – historical milestones

HO de Waal
African Large Predator Research Unit (ALPRU), Bloemfontein 9300, South Africa
dewaalho@ufs.ac.za; dewaalho0@gmail.com

Executive Summary

South Africa has a history of human-predator conflict, but memories tend to fade and facts become blurred; therefore, an attempt was made to restore institutional memory by providing historical milestones regarding predation management in South Africa from the 1950s. References are also made to a record citing predation near the present Cape Town, dating back to June 1656. Predation information is provided for the four erstwhile provinces in South Africa, namely the Cape of Good Hope, Orange Free State, Transvaal and Natal Provinces.

The timeline transcends the previous geopolitical dispensation in South Africa to a new arrangement, which was created from 28 April 1994 with the reconfiguration of nine provinces, namely the Western Cape, Northern Cape, Eastern Cape, Free State, KwaZulu-Natal, North West, Gauteng, Mpumalanga and Limpopo Provinces.

Official reports, letters, minutes and publications, both scientific and popular, were collated to create factual records or institutional memory in South Africa. The timeline is more continuous and comprehensive for some periods and provinces, simply because it was easier to retrieve historical information. Although references are made to theses, dissertations, scientific and popular publications, this timeline is not a literature review.

Predation management was officially supported during the late 1950s to early 1990s by the four erstwhile provinces of South Africa, but levels of official support varied considerably.

The Cape Provincial Administration (CPA) subsidised the hunters of registered private hunt clubs and to maintain packs of hunt hounds; in addition, staff was remunerated and three predation management centres were maintained, the largest being Vrolijkheid near Robertson with smaller facilities at Adelaide and Hartswater.

The Provincial Administration Orange Free State (PAO) subsidised a major part of Oranjejag's activities (the single statutory predator control association in the Province); official funding was also used to improve and maintain Bathurst, Oranjejag's main centre of operations and its only permanent facility.

The Natal Province Administration (NPA) contributed undisclosed amounts to subsidise private predator hunt clubs, as well as to pay bounties for predators killed by individuals.

The Transvaal Provincial Administration (TPA) subsidised only one voluntary private organisation, namely the Transvaal Federal Problem Animal Control Association (TFPACA).

A large portion of the information presented is not readily available in the public domain. Furthermore, the numbers of animals reportedly killed are less than those actually killed in South Africa, simply because unknown numbers of animals were not reported. It applies to both the predation losses and the predators killed.

The minutes of meetings demonstrate the efforts that have been made by livestock farmers, wildlife ranchers and other role players to gain official support and engage in a practical system of coordinated predation management. Assuming minutes objectively reflected proceedings, at times individuals have pursued different and ostensibly even opposing personal agendas, especially from 2009. Gaps exist in the timeline, because relevant information is still missing. Information is cited more comprehensively for some events and may seem repetitive for consecutive years, but is necessary to establish a continuous timeline of events.

On 23 July 1987, an important meeting was held at Harrismith in the eastern Orange Free State Province, with the focus on problem animals. The meeting stemmed from an initiative of the National Wool Growers' Association of South Africa (NWGA) to establish a Problem Animal

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

Sub-committee and was attended by officials of the four provincial administrations and livestock producers, represented by the Red Meat Producers' Organisation (RPO). The process evolved with follow-up meetings and, as a tangible outcome, the National Problem Animal Policy Committee (NPAPC) was established in Bloemfontein on Monday 27 November 1989. The proceedings were meticulously noted in minutes and correspondence; proficiently managed by the NPAPC's first Secretary, Mr. Theuns Botha[1] (Manager: NWGA)[2]. The initiative culminated in the Problem Animal Control Forum that was convened from 4-5 May 1993 at the Golden Gate Highlands National Park in the eastern Orange Free State Province. Mr. Nico Vermaak administrated and recoded these proceedings in detail.

Proceedings of the Problem Animal Control Forum (4-5 May 1993), as well as two other important meetings, namely the Ganzekraal Workshop (10-13 April 2006) which was held at the Ganzekraal Conference Centre, Western Cape, near Cape Town and the National Workshop for Provinces on Human-Wildlife Conflict Management (27-28 August 2007) which was held at the Ritz Restaurant, Sea Point, Cape Town, are explored and presented in detail.

Pursuant to the Workshop at Golden Gate (4-5 May 1993), the NPAPC released an English version of the *National Policy and Strategy for Problem Animal Control in South Africa* on 17 February 1994. Prior to the Ritz Restaurant Workshop, the draft *National Environmental Management: Biodiversity Act, 2004 (Act 10 of 2004): Human-Wildlife Conflict Management ("Damage-Causing Wild Animals") in South Africa Regulations* was issued. It showed the Minister's (Environmental Affairs and Tourism) intent to issue regulations on Human-Wildlife Conflict Management in terms of Section 97 of the NEMBA, 2004 (Act No. 10 of 2004).

The future of the NPAPC was discussed on 29 May 1996 and those present felt that it had a role to play. However, direct access to the offices of the provincial MEC's was an important factor. Therefore, those present were requested to liaise directly with the respective MEC's and endeavour to receive mandates from the highest level regarding problem animal control. The outcome of the negotiations varied and with little firm commitments.

Subsequently, Mr. Jannie Kemp, Chairperson: NPAPC made a special effort to revive the initiative and invited a range of important role players to attend a meeting of the Committee, scheduled from 7-9 September 1998 at the Jonkershoek Nature Conservation Station near Stellenbosch, Western Cape Province. Again, the responses and subsequent commitments, especially for urgently needed financial support of the NPAPC were elusive.

If decisions and recommendations from the meetings and national workshops since 1987 were followed through to practical implementation, it could have contributed meaningful to mitigate the negative impact of predation in South Africa. From the records, it was clear that financial constraints, prior to and since the Problem Animal Control Forum in May 1993, played an important role in preventing many of the envisaged goals from being achieved.

During 2008, Mr. Niël Viljoen, a predation specialist, started recruiting and developing a number of demonstration/monitor' farms in the six predominantly wool sheep provinces (Western Cape, Northern Cape, Eastern Cape, Free State, KwaZulu-Natal and Mpumalanga). The project was conducted under the auspices of the NWGA and actively monitored and collected data on small livestock losses and predators killed, while serving as demonstration sites to conduct information courses. Over time a large number of information sessions were conducted which were attended by livestock farmers, their farm workers and predation hunters.

On 2 July 2009, the Livestock and Wildlife Working Group on Damage Causing Animals was founded in Port Elizabeth. The organised livestock industries, namely the NWGA, RPO, SAMGA (South African Mohair Growers' Association) and WRSA (Wildlife Ranching South Africa) united in an effort to provide a united platform for liaison and find practical solutions for

[1] Editor's Note: Mr. Theuns (T.F.J.) Botha later became a well-respected journalist and the Editor: Eastern Cape of the *Landbouweekblad*. Theuns passed away on 15 September 2019 in Port Elizabeth.

[2] Editor's Note: It was noted that from about 20 December 1991 Mr. Theuns (T.F.J.) Botha was succeeded by Mr. Nico (N.J.) Vermaak as the Secretary: NPAPC. In turn, Mr. Vermaak was succeeded on about 19 July 1995 by Mr. Kevin (K.A.) van Tonder and from about 13 August 1998 Mrs. Bonita Francis was the Secretary: NPAPC.

Version 5.0 – HD-DB Web Version 5.0

reducing the negative impact of predation. On 20-21 April 2010, the group was renamed as Predation Management Forum (PMF).

Since 1994, ongoing efforts were made to involve the department of environmental affairs and the department of agriculture as equal partners in coordinated predation management. However, the constitutional arrangement of a "1+9" scenario for the two national and the nine provincial departments was not particularly helpful in addressing the fragmented approaches and uncoordinated predation management activities. Legislation and regulations regarding predation management continued to be archaic and differed between provinces. Showing good intent to advance the initiative, a General Notice was published in the Government Gazette of 29 November 2010, i.e. Notice 1084 of 2010 - "*Draft Norms and Standards for the Management of Damage-Causing animals in South Africa*." Since, stakeholders made input, but towards the end of 2019, the draft document was still not finalised because the provinces claimed that their legislation could not be finalised until the National Norms & Standards have been promulgated.

In April 2013, an important initiative was launched in the Western Cape Province. A Co-operative Agreement was signed between the Predator Management Forum (Western Cape) and the Western Cape Nature Conservation Board trading as CapeNature. Seemingly, none of the other eight provinces initiated any comparable co-operative agreements.

The initiative and tireless efforts to create a system of coordinated predation management in South Africa were continued by ALPRU (African Large Predator Research Unit) at the University of the Free State (UFS). After seemingly endless lobbying and deliberations with role players, representatives of the NWGA, RPO, SAMGA, WRSA and UFS signed four service agreements from 23 February 2017 and the Predation Management information Centre (PMiC) became officially operational on 1 March 2017 at the UFS. The PMiC sourced, processed, archived and disseminated a large volume of information on predation management over a period of two years. The PMF discontinued the initiative from 1 March 2019, financial constraints being a major primary reason.

The information presented here is intended to broaden the information base and recreate a South African institutional memory to inform and enable the establishment of a system of coordinated predation management.

The first meeting of Predation Management South Africa (PMSA) Forum was held on Friday 23 August 2019 at the UFS in Bloemfontein.

In February 2020, a novel coronavirus struck the globe; it causes a lethal condition Covid-19 in humans with unprecedented global alarm. On 15 March 2020, the South African government declared a National State of Disaster and imposed a total National Lockdown after midnight 26 March 2020. Of special importance was the total clampdown on travelling, except for emergencies and the consequent devastating economic impact on most sectors of economic activity in South Africa.

This Lockdown also affected the livestock farming and wildlife ranching communities. Professional problem animal hunters were also restricted and could not provide the normal routine services. Farmers and ranchers could still implement customary predation control on their farms, but many relied on the services of professional problem animal hunters. Very little information is available, but it is safe to assume that during the Lockdown, the livestock and wildlife losses caused by predators in South Africa would have continued unabated.

On 14 October 2020, the Secretariat: PMSA communicated by e-mail with a selection of universities and other research structures in South Africa regarding '*Research- & tertiary institutions as well as research structures within agricultural commodities are requested to consider, pursue and or fund research projects and programs in support of priorities'*.

The devastating Covid-19 pandemic manifested in a third wave of infection in South Africa, therefore, under the provisions of the National State of Disaster, the country was moved to a phased Level 4 of Lockdown from 28 June 2021.

This compilation of historical milestones is an ongoing project; therefore, no claim is made regarding completeness.

Version 5.0 - PhD de Waal, Version 2.0

Key words: coordinated predation management, cage trap, coyote getter, damage-causing animals, foothold trap, hounds, human-predator conflict, institutional memory, livestock losses, predation, predators, problem animals, vagrant dogs, vermin, and wildlife losses.

Editor's Note

Official reports, letters, faxes, minutes of meetings and published scientific and popular articles were used to create a factual basis of record or institutional memory to inform coordinated predation management in South Africa.

The historical timeline is more comprehensive and continuous for some periods and provinces because information was easier retrieved from sources.

References are made to theses, dissertations, and articles published in scientific and popular journals, but this is not a literature review.

Gaps remain because relevant information could not be found. Many old documents are in Afrikaans, but it was endeavoured to prevent loss of content and detail during translation.

No comments are made in any form, shape or way on the statements made and conclusions drawn by authors in the cited documents.

Except for translations (from Afrikaans) and some minor editorial changes in the format and spelling, original documents and excerpts are cited exact (printed in italics) without changes in the grammar.

When appropriate, the official acronyms (listed below) have been substituted in the text for the long versions of entities/organisations/associations.

A large volume of new information was published in the PMF/PMSA Newsletters from May 2014 to June 2021 and is included in Version 5.0.

List of Acronyms

ALPRU	African Larger Predator Research Unit
AVCASA	Agricultural and Veterinary Chemicals Association of South Africa
Compound 1080	Sodium monofluoroacetate
CPA	Cape Provincial Administration
DAFF	Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries
DEA	Department of Environmental Affairs
DEAT	Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism
DoA	Department of Agriculture
IPADCC	Interprovincial Problem Animal Damage Control Committee
HCG	Humane Coyote Getter
MEC	Member of Executive Committee - prior to 28 April 1994
	Member of Executive Council - from 28 April 1994
NaCN	sodium cyanide
NEMBA	National Environmental Management: Biodiversity Act, 2004 (Act No. 10 of 2004)
NMMU	Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University
NPA	Natal Provincial Administration
NPAPC	National Problem Animal Policy Committee
NSPCA	National Council of Societies for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals
NWGA	National Wool Growers' Association of South Africa
NWKV	'Nasionale Wolkwekersvereniging van Suid-Afrika'[3]
OFS	Orange Free State
PAO	Provincial Administration Orange Free State
PHASA	Professional Hunters Association of South Africa
PMC	Predation Management Centre
PMiC	Predation Management information Centre
PMF	Predation Management Forum
PMSA	Predation Management SA
RPO	Red Meat Producers' Organisation
RSC	Regional Services Council
SAMGA	South African Mohair Growers' Association
TFPACA	Transvaal Federal Problem Animal Control Association
TFPBV	'Federale Probleemdier Bestrydingsvereniging'[4]
TPA	Transvaal Provincial Administration
TVL	Transvaal
TAU	Transvaal Agricultural Union
UCT	University of Cape Town
UFS	University of the Free State
UP	University of Pretoria
WRSA	Wildlife Ranching South Africa

Version 5.0 - HD de Waal - Version 5.0

[3] Editor's Note: Afrikaans version of NWGA.
[4] Editor's Note: Afrikaans version of TFPACA.

Predation management in South Africa – historical milestones

Background to the historical milestones

South Africa has a long history of human-predator conflict and there should be no illusion about the negative impact of predation; daily, predators kill and maim large numbers of animals on livestock farms and wildlife ranches. Predators and, inevitably non-target animals, are also killed daily by means of various methods[5].

Two medium-sized predators, namely the black-backed jackal (*Canis mesomelas*) and the caracal (*Caracal caracal*) are mostly implicated for the predation losses. Vagrant dogs (*Canis familiaris*) also cause considerable losses, especially near human settlements. Compared to the damage caused by these species, predation losses caused by Cape foxes (*Vulpes chama*), leopards (*Panthera pardus*), lions (*P. leo*), brown hyaenas (*Parahyaena brunnea*) and cheetahs (*Acinonyx jubatus*) occur in relatively isolated cases and on a smaller scale.

In addition, other mammals[6], avians[7] and reptiles were also killed during operations to control damage-causing or so-called problem animals. The following list of animals are known to have been killed as damage-causing species, or simply involved as collateral damage:

- Aardvark - *Orycteropus afer* (Afrikaans - 'Erdvark')
- Aardwolf - *Proteles cristatus* (Afrikaans - 'Maanhaarjakkals')
- Baboon, Chacma - *Papio hamadryas ursinus* (Afrikaans - 'Bobbejaan')
- Badger, Honey - *Mellivora capensis* (Afrikaans - 'Ratel')
- Blesbok - *Damaliscus pygargus phillipsi* (Afrikaans - 'Blesbok')
- Bontebok - *Damaliscus pygargus dorcas* (Afrikaans - 'Bontebok')
- Bushpig - *Potamochoerus larvatus* (Afrikaans - 'Bosvark')
- Bustard, Denham's - *Neotis denhami* (Afrikaans - 'Veldpou')
- Bustard, Kori - *Ardeotis kori* (Afrikaans - 'Gompou')
- Bustard, Ludwig's - *Neotis ludwigii* (Afrikaans - 'Ludwigse Pou')
- Caracal - *Caracal caracal* (Afrikaans - 'Rooikat' / 'Lynx')
- Cat, African wild - *Felis silvestris lybica* (Afrikaans - 'Groukat' / 'Vaalboskat")
- Cattle - *Bos taurus* and *B. indicus* (Afrikaans 'Beeste')
- Cheetah - *Acinonyx jubatus* (Afrikaans - 'Jagluiperd' / 'Cheetah')
- Crane, Blue - *Anthropoides paradiseus* (Afrikaans - 'Bloukraanvoël')
- Crane, Crowned - *Balearica regulorum* (Afrikaans - 'Mahem')
- Crane, Wattled - *Grus carunculatus* (Afrikaans - 'Lelkraanvoël')
- Crow, black - *Corvus capensis* (Afrikaans - 'Swartkraai')
- Crow, pied - *Corvus albus* (Afrikaans - 'Witborskraai')
- Dingo - *Canis lupus dingo* (Afrikaans - 'Dingo')
- Donkey - *Equus asinus* (Afrikaans - 'Donkie')
- Duiker, Common / Grey - *Sylvicapra grimmia* (Afrikaans - 'Duiker')
- Dog, African wild - *Lycaon pictus* (Afrikaans - 'Wildehond')
- Dog, vagrant - *Canis lupus familiaris* (Afrikaans - 'Hond' / 'Brak')
- Eagle, Verreaux's - *Aquila verreauxii* (Afrikaans - 'Witkruisarend')

[5] De Waal, H.O., 2009. Recent advances in co-ordinated predator management in South Africa. *Merino SA Focus* 2009, 44-46.
[6] Bronner, G.N., Hoffmann, M., Taylor, P.J., Chimimba, C.T., Best, P.B., Matthee, C.A. & Robinson, T.J. 2003. A revised systematic checklist of the extant mammals of the southern African subregion. *Durban Museum Novitates* 28, 56-106.
[7] Sinclair, Ian, Hockey, Phil & Tarboton, Warwick, 2002. Sasol Birds of Southern Africa. Third Edition. Struik Uitgewers, CapeTown.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

Eland - *Tragelaphus oryx* (Afrikaans - 'Eland')
Fox, Bat-eared - *Otocyon megalotis* (Afrikaans - 'Bakoorvos' / 'Bakoorjakkals')
Fox, Cape - *Vulpes chama* (Afrikaans - 'Silwervos' / 'Draaijakkals')
Genet, Common/Rusty-spotted - *Genetta maculata* (Afrikaans - 'Rooikolmuskejaatkat')
Genet, Small-spotted - *Genetta genetta* (Afrikaans - 'Kleinkolmuskejaatkat')
Genet, South African large-spotted - *Genetta tigrina* (Afrikaans - 'Grootkolmuskejaatkat')
Goat, Angora - *Capra aegagrus hircus* (Afrikaans - 'Sybok' / 'Angorabok')
Goat, Boerbok / domesticated - *Capra aegagrus hircus* (Afrikaans - 'Boerbok' / 'Bok')
Grysbok, Cape - *Raphicerus melanotis* (Afrikaans - 'Kaapse Grysbok')
Hare, Cape - *Lepus capensis* (Afrikaans - 'Vlakhaas')
Hyaena, brown - *Parahyaena brunnea* (Afrikaans - 'Strandjut' / 'Bruinhiëna')
Hyaena, spotted - *Crocuta crocuta* (Afrikaans - 'Gevlekte hiëna')
Hyrax, Rock - *Procavia capensis* (Afrikaans - 'Klipdassie')
Impala - *Aepyceros melampus melampus* (Afrikaans - 'Rooibok')
Jackal, Black-backed - *Canis mesomelas* (Afrikaans - 'Rooijakkals' / 'Blourug')
Jackal, Side-striped - *Canis adustus* (Afrikaans - 'Witkwasjakkals')
Korhaan - *Eupodotis* spp. (Afrikaans - 'Korhaan')
Leguaan - *Varanus exanthematicus* (Afrikaans - 'Likkewaan')
Leopard - *Panthera pardus* (Afrikaans - 'Luiperd')
Lion, African - *Panthera leo* (Afrikaans - 'Leeu')
Meerkat - *Suricata suricatta* (Afrikaans - 'Stokstertmeerkat')
Mongoose, Cape Grey - *Galerella pulverolenta* (Afrikaans - 'Kleingrysmuishond')
Mongoose, Marsh - *Atilax paludinosus* (Afrikaans - 'Watermuishond')
Mongoose, Yellow - *Cynictis penicillata* (Afrikaans - 'Witkwasmuishond')
Monkey, Vervet - *Cercopithecus pygerythrus* (Afrikaans - 'Blouaap')
Ostrich, Common - *Struthio camelus* (Afrikaans - 'Volstruis')
Peacock, common - *Pavo cristatus* (Afrikaans - 'Makpou' / 'Pou')
Pheasant - *Pternistes* spp. (Afrikaans - 'Fisant')
Porcupine, Cape - *Hystrix africaeaustralis* (Afrikaans - 'Ystervark')
Rhebok, Grey - *Pelea capreolus* (Afrikaans - 'Vaalribbok')
Secretarybird - *Sagittarius serpentarius* (Afrikaans - 'Sekretarisvoël')
Serval - *Leptailurus serval* (Afrikaans - 'Tierboskat')
Sheep - *Ovis aries* (Afrikaans - 'Skaap')
Springbok - *Antidorcas marsupialis* (Afrikaans - 'Springbok')
Steenbok - *Raphicerus campestris* (Afrikaans - 'Steenbok')
Vulture, Cape - *Gyps coprotheres* (Afrikaans - 'Kransaasvoël')
Warthog, Common - *Phacochoerus africanus* (Afrikaans -'Vlakvark')
Waterbuck - *Kobus ellipsiprymnus* (Afrikaans - 'Waterbok')
Wildebeest, Black - *Connochaetes gnou* (Afrikaans - 'Swartwildebees')

Historical milestones are provided for important predation management events in South Africa from the 1950s. References are also made to older records of predation near the present Cape Town, namely June 1656. Predation information is provided for the four erstwhile provinces, namely the Cape of Good Hope, Orange Free State, Transvaal and Natal Provinces (**Annexure A**). A new dispensation was created from 28 April 1994 in South Africa, with a geographical reconfiguration in nine provinces, namely the Western Cape, Northern Cape, Eastern Cape, Free State, KwaZulu-Natal, North West, Gauteng, Mpumalanga and Limpopo Provinces (**Annexure B**).

Version 5.0 - Ho dawad - Version 5.0

At the Ganzekraal Workshop (10-13 April 2006), Mr. Hannes Stadler[8] alluded to problem animal management in the Cape Province of South Africa: "*The first records of human-wildlife conflict experienced in southern Africa date back to the establishment of the first European settlement in the Cape Colony in 1652 and are recorded in detail in the dairies of Governor Jan van Riebeeck*." Predators such as lion, spotted hyaena and brown hyaena *"(called 'wolves' in those days) killed livestock within a stone's throw of the Fort and these animals were even considered a threat to the safety of the inhabitants of the settlement.*" The VOC refreshment station for merchant mariners was established in April 1652 at the Cape of Good Hope; the challenge of wild animals destroying crops and livestock was justification for Jan van Riebeeck, Commander of the Dutch East India Company ("*Vereenigde Oost-Indische Compagnie*"; VOC), to introduce a bounty system in June 1656.

Beinart (2003)[9] provided information on predation in South Africa over a period of about two centuries. Previously Beinart (1998)[10] alluded to old official and personal sources to sketch the long history and views of predation in the old Cape Province, specifically the impact of black-backed jackals on small livestock, namely:

- detail on the numbers of small livestock lost and predators killed;
- the concerted efforts to eradicate this vermin[11] and specifically the widespread use of the deadly poison strychnine;
- the role of government and the official support given to farmers;
- the kraaling of livestock at night to protect them from predators and thieves;
- the negative deteriorating impact caused by kraaling livestock at night on both the veld and condition of livestock;
- the introduction of wire mesh fences from the 1890s with verandas or overhangs to exclude predators from livestock in camps and eventually predator-proofing of whole farms;
- government subsidies for farmers to erect predator-proof fences on their farms;
- the pros and cons of a bounty system; and
- after cessation of state bounties in 1908, "*local rewards were still available*".

Despite historical records, South Africa still lacks institutional memory on predation management[12], especially with limited information on the impact of predation on livestock farms, communal land and wildlife ranches. Predator control systems with official financial support were implemented during the 1960s to 1990s, but when official subsidisation was withdrawn, activities stopped or petered out into non-existence; therefore, official recording of predator control activities became virtually non-existent[13]. However, some private predator control initiatives were retained, because of the lucrative business opportunities it presented for skilled predator hunters.

Citing historical information sequentially on an annual basis

[8] Stadler, H., 2006. Historical perspective on the development of problem animal management in the Cape Province. In: Daly, B., Davies-Mostert, H., Davies-Mostert, W., Evans, S., Friedmann, Y., King, N., Snow, T. & Stadler, H. (eds.): 2006. Prevention is the Cure. Proceedings of a workshop on holistic management of human-wildlife conflict in the agricultural sector of South Africa. (pp. 11-16). Endangered Wildlife Trust, Johannesburg.

[9] Beinart, W., 2003. The rise of conservation in South Africa: settlers, livestock and the environment 1770-1950. Oxford: Oxford University Press

[10] Beinart, W., 1998. The night of the jackal: sheep, pastures and predation. *Past & Present* 158, 172-206.

[11] Editor's Note: the word 'vermin' was used to describe damage-causing predators. However, it was endeavoured later to officially remove all references to 'vermin' from public discourse and records.

[12] Bergman, D.L., De Waal, H.O., Avenant, N.L., Bodenchuk, M.J., Marlow, M.C. & Dale, D.L., 2013. The need to address black-backed jackal and caracal predation in South Africa. Proceedings 15th Wildlife Damage Management Conference, 25-28 March 2013, Clemson, South Carolina (J.B. Armstrong, G.R. Gallagher, Eds.).

[13] De Waal, H.O., 2009. Recent advances in co-ordinated predator management in South Africa. Merino SA Focus 2009, 44-46.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

1957 – Cape Province

In 1917, the first ordinance on the extermination of vermin in the Cape Province came into effect and, until 11 October 1957, three more ordinances, with 22 amendments followed[14]. Early ordinances provided for bounties paid on animals that were described as vermin and paying subsidies to maintain the packs of hunt hounds[15] used to exterminate so-called vermin.

In various circles there was growing dissatisfaction with the bounty system and the large sums being paid to exterminate so-called vermin in the Cape Province; therefore, a committee was previously appointed in 1955 to investigate the case of vermin extermination. Acting on the recommendations of this committee, the Ordinance on the Extermination of Vermin, No. 26 of 1957, was proclaimed on 11 October 1957. The Ordinance abolished the bounty system and provided for subsidised hunt clubs under the supervision of the Department of Nature Conservation, Cape Provincial Administration (CPA). The CPA also had to provide for the breeding and the training of hunts hounds, training of hunters, conducting research on methods of exterminating vermin and advising farmers regarding the methods developed because of the research.

1958 – Cape Province

In May 1958 the CPA acquired Vrolijkheid[16]; a 2 570 ha farm located about 12 km south of Robertson on the road to McGregor. Vrolijkheid became well known as the Vermin Research Farm and Hound Breeding Station; thus creating the Division Problem Animal Control of the Department of Nature Conservation.

Dr. Douglas Hey, Director of Nature Conservation, CPA, spearheaded this ground breaking initiative and insisted that the hound breeding and training facilities at Vrolijkheid[17] should meet the requirements set for such a station. Dr. Hey made a detailed investigation of the requirements. Accompanied by Mr. C. Lochner, an architect who was tasked to do the necessary planning of facilities at Vrolijkheid, they visited the hound-breeding stations of the Transvaal and Orange Free State Provincial Administrations. Hounds for breeding purposes were later purchased from the Provincial Administrations of the Transvaal and Orange Free State.

The first batch of 14 high-class Jackal hounds and 2 greyhounds were purchased for breeding purposes in September 1958. The animals were temporarily housed on the farm of the senior hound master, Mr. D.H. Smith and moved to Vrolijkheid once the kennels had been completed.

A variety of test animals including black-backed jackals, Cape foxes and caracals were also acquired and accommodated at Vrolijkheid.

1961 – Cape Province

After a four-month study tour in the USA during 1959, Dr. Hey (Director: Nature Conservation, CPA) decided to introduce the so-called coyote getter to the Cape Province. At his request, the United States Bureau of Sports, Fisheries and Wildlife granted permission for a specialist, Mr. Malcolm Allison to visit the Cape Province in 1961[18] and assist in adapting American

[14] Anonymous, 1977-1978. Probleemdierbeheer. Kaapse Departement van Natuurbewaring en Museumdienste. Verslag Nr. 34. pp. 57-65.
[15] Editor's Note: throughout the document the word "hound" refers to animals specifically bred and trained to hunt problem animals, while "dog" refers to vagrant animals.
[16] The Dutch for 'Vrolikheid' (in Afrikaans) or the English cheerfulness.
[17] Anonymous, 1961. The Hound Breeding Station. Department of Nature Conservation. Report No. 18. pp. 86-91.
[18] Allison, M.N., 1961. Report of Predator Control Activities. Cape of Good Hope March 14 to June 23, 1961. Department of Nature Conservation. Report No. 18. pp. 92-97.

Version 5.0 - Hoole Waal - Version 5.0

techniques in predator control to South Africa. Mr. Allison also trained personnel of the Department of Nature Conservation to conduct and carry on the work in the future. The field trials with coyote getters in South Africa were conducted on farms in the areas of Adelaide, Fort Beaufort and Alexandria and lasted six weeks. The first black-backed jackal "*killed by the coyote getter in South Africa was on the Douglas Gardner ranch, Warwickford, on 21 April 1961. The jackal had evidently pulled the getter the first night after it was set, as the carcass was practically decayed. It was a large jackal but the sex could not be determined."*

According to Blom & Connolly (2003),[19] "*sodium cyanide (NaCN) ejectors have been used in Federal/Cooperative predator damage control programs since the late 1930s. The first model was the Humane Coyote Getter (HCG), more commonly known as the coyote getter (CG). It was used in federally supervised control programs for almost 40 years, until November 1, 1970 when it officially was replaced by the spring-activated M-44. The M-44, with many modifications over the years, remains in use today. Both CGs and M-44s were designed to eject a toxic mixture of NaCN powder when pulled by a coyote. The 2 devices differ primarily in their mode of ejection – the coyote getter (CG) fired a .38 Special cartridge case that contained toxicant, whereas M-44 cyanide capsule contents are expelled by the release of a spring-driven plunger*."

Under South African law, expulsion of NaCN toxicant by a .38 Special cartridge characterised the detonator of the coyote getter as a "firearm" and inevitably, it was stopped from being used.

In a 3-year period years since the inception of the Hound Breeding Station at Vrolijkheid[20] in 1958, 391 hounds were bred of which 174 were sold to hunt clubs and individual farmers. A growing demand for trained hunting hounds, especially leader hounds, created a long waiting list. Very favourable feedback was received regarding the performance of trained hounds, especially when the purchasers sent their hunters to Vrolijkheid to collect the hounds and acquainted themselves with the handling and training methods at the station.

The Administration started arranging to establish a sub-depot at Adelaide (in the summer rainfall area of South Africa) where adult hounds could be transferred from Vrolijkheid (in the winter rainfall area of South Africa) for training and to constitute packs of hunting hounds.

Limited facilities were available at Vrolijkheid and only six hunters could be accommodated for the training courses that lasted two weeks. Riding horses were also available for the hound masters during training and hunting with the hound packs. Lectures included topics on conservation, hound welfare, training of hounds and the latest predator control methods. Lectures were supplemented by extensive practical work and demonstrations at the kennels and in the field. On completion of a course the hunters received certificates reflecting their training and special aptitudes.

Two large and 10 smaller enclosures were erected at Vrolijkheid to accommodate black-backed jackals and caracals for breeding experiments; the natural landscape was retained in these facilities for the animals to live naturally.

Under the guidance of Mr. Malcolm Allison, a senior USA Predator Control Specialist, preparatory field trials on farms were conducted in March 1961 in the Robertson area.

[19] Blom, F.S. & Connolly, G., 2003. Inventing and Reinventing Sodium Cyanide Ejectors. A Technical History of Coyote Getters and M-44s in Predator Damage Control. Research Report 03-02. Wildlife Services, National Wildlife Research Center. Fort Collins, Colorado.

[20] Anonymous, 1958. The Provincial Vermin Research Farm "Vrolijkheid". Department of Nature Conservation. Report No. 15. pp. 76-84.

Version 5.0 - HD de Waal - Version 5.0

Extensive field trials were conducted with coyote getters and various poisons in the Alexandria and Fort Beaufort districts. In field trials conducted in the districts of Alexandria, Fort Beaufort, Adelaide, Alice, Robertson, Oudtshoorn, Montagu and Bonnievale: 837 coyote getters were set of which 112 were activated (pulled), accounting for the killing of 31 black-backed jackals, 6 vagrant dogs, 2 civets, 2 grey mongooses, 2 Cape foxes, 2 leguaan and 1 ostrich.

The carcasses of 31 black-backed jackals killed were recovered between 27.4 and 57.6 m (average of 36.6 m) from the coyote getters, whereas the dogs were recovered at an average distance of 91.4 m. The same number of male and female black-backed jackals were killed, suggesting that there was no sex preference for the artificial baits.

The actual number of black-backed jackals killed was higher because a number of carcases were found later and it was established that some carcasses were removed by unknown individuals for claiming the bounties.

In the field trials, Mr. Malcolm Allison was accompanied by Mr. K.J. van Rensburg (Senior Research Officer, Vrolijkheid), Mr. D.E. Compion (Inspector of Predator Control, Vrolijkheid) and Mr. P.F. Louw (Inspector of Flora and Fauna, Cape Town) and by special arrangement with the Transvaal Provincial Administration (TPA), Mr. Rex D. Janse van Rensburg (Research Officer, Panfontein near Bloemhof). First hand, practical training and experience were gained in using this new predator control device and preparation of baits.

Mr. P.F. Louw[21] produced an extensive first-hand report on his experience while accompanying Mr. Allison during the field trials with coyote getters in South Africa.

A very successful short course was conducted for hunters at the end of May 1961 and was attended by 15 hunters and other interested persons and farmers from all parts of the Province. Dr. Douglas Hey, Director of Nature Conservation, and Mr. Malcolm Allison, the visiting scientist from the USA Branch of Predator Control, lectured on predator control, the coyote getter, poisons and the latest methods of predator control. Mr. D.E. Compion was entrusted with the subject of rearing and training of hounds for trainee hunters. Mr. Allison's presence and the lectures on the new methods of predatory control were particularly instructive and were appreciated by the 28 attendees.

After conducting the field trials successfully, Mr. Malcolm Allison returned to the USA in June 1961. Mr. van Rensburg and Mr. Compion continued the field trials during the last six months of 1961 at Vrolijkheid and in other areas of the Cape Province. These tests showed great promise of the coyote getter being applied with success under South African conditions.

It is very important to note the specific statements and recommendations by Mr. Malcolm Allison in his "*Report of Predator Control Activities*":

> "*The experience in the United States of the Bureau of Sports, Fisheries and Wildlife in predator control shows that for a program to be successful it must be operated and managed by an agency in authority. This is particularly true when lethal agents and devices such as the coyote getter are utilized. And utilized they must be if the costs of the program are to be kept within reasonable limits. This applies to the Western part of the United States and applies as well to the Cape Province.*
>
> *Effective control of predatory animals can only be accomplished by a carefully organized program under the direction of an agency in a position and qualified to direct*

[21] Louw, P.F., 1961. First Trials with the Coyote-Getter in South Africa. Department of Nature Conservation. Report No. 18. pp. 98-100.

Version 5.0 - HOD Wahal - Version 5.0

the work. The employment of salaried hunters, paid either by the Province or paid on co-operative payrolls and controlled by the Province is mandatory. The bounty system will not be discussed here, but definitely, it fails in the purpose it is set out to accomplish. In prosecuting predator control every available means must be utilized, hounds, poison, coyote getters, steel traps, and other methods not so well defined. The gentlemen engaged in the operation must be willing to use all techniques in their work as directed.

The conditions here in the Cape Province are very similar to many of our states in America. Large farms (ranches), many camps (pastures) enclosed by netted (jackal-proof) fences to combat the predator.

It must be emphasized that the layman cannot be supplied with instruments like the coyote getter, and especially a poison as deadly as 1080. There would be indiscriminate use by many individuals and these useful weapons in predator control would become a menace. Whereas, these methods utilized by qualified Government personnel, under rigid regulations will ensure their safe and effective use. The distribution of these devices should be strictly controlled by the Department of Nature Conservation."

1961/63 – Transvaal Province

Mr. Rex Janse van Rensburg participated in the field trials with coyote getters that were conducted during 1961 in the Cape Province by Mr. Malcom Allison, a senior USA specialist in Predator Control. Upon his return to the Transvaal Mr. Rex Janse van Rensburg conducted field trials with coyote getters at the S.A. Lombard Nature Reserve, near Bloemhof and elsewhere in the Transvaal Province. In a preliminary report on the results of these trials with coyote getters, the extent of sheep losses through predation was documented[22]. Facilities at the S.A. Lombard Nature Reserve were used to examine at close quarters the results when black-backed jackals activated (pulled) coyote getters. Within 50 seconds of pulling a coyote getter, the animal was dead and it is important to note, "*No indication of pain or discomfort was observed*". In total, 878 coyote getters were set from 2 October 1961 to 27 March 1962 in 10 districts of the Transvaal Province. Most of the earlier trials were conducted on reserves where large black-backed jackal populations were present to develop baits that are more appropriate. Trials were later conducted on farms where relatively small black-backed jackal populations occurred. In total, 100 animal carcasses were retrieved, including 61 black-backed jackals. These 30 male and 31 female carcasses "*comprised 14 young adults, 46 fully matured and one an old jackal with badly worn teeth*". On average carcasses were retrieved 47.4 (12-130) yards [43.3 (11-119) m] from the coyote getters. It was concluded, "*Due to lack of experience, the first field trials were not very successful*". However, reflecting on the selectivity of the coyote getter to control black-backed jackals, it was stated: in the trials with the "humane coyote-getter", 24.2% of the total number of animals killed was not problem animals. This compared favourably with the 21.3% obtained by Hound masters of the TPA and the 23.4% by the Federal Vermin Destruction Society[23].

[22] Janse van Rensburg, Rex D., 1965. Preliminary report on the "Humane Coyote-Getter" for the control of the Black-backed jackal *Thos mesomelas* in the Transvaal. *Zoologica Africana* 1(1), 193-198.

Table 1: Sheep lost through predation in the Transvaal

	Total sheep lost (all causes)*	Sheep lost through predation	Sheep lost through predation as % of Total Losses
1949-50	260 844	40 813	15.6
1950-51	228 332	30 806	13.5
1951-52	234 360	33 961	14.5
1952-53	297 554	33 819	11.4
1954-54	318 181	37 782	11.9
1959-60	286 753	28 075	9.8

*Figures supplied by the Bureaux of Statistics, Pretoria.

[2323] Editor's Note: Federale Probleemdierbestrydingsvereniging (FPBV) or Federal Problem Animal Control Association of Transvaal.

Version 5.0 – HO de Waal – Version 5.0

1962/63 – Orange Free State Province

A report regarding the eradication of vermin (Memo B.218/4 – 12 July 1962 regarding *"Nr. 559 - Verslag van die Kommissie van Ondersoek in verband met die Uitroei van Ongediertes, 1960*") was presented for consideration to the Executive Committee of the PAO. In what became watershed decisions on predation management in the Orange Free State Province, the Executive Committee resolved among others on 6 August 1962[24] to:

- abolish from 1 April 1963 all bounties paid for the extermination of vermin;
- stop paying subsidies to all existing hunt associations from 1 April 1963;
- pay from 1 April 1963 subsidies to hunt associations that operate on more than 1 million morgen (856 700 ha[25]) and considered to function efficiently by the Administration;
- increase the penalty for using poison;
- control the use of coyote getters and the poison to kill vermin and vagrant dogs; and
- impose penalties for killing servals, honey badgers, Cape foxes and African wildcats.

1964 – Cape Province

The Predator Control Research Farm and Hound Breeding Station at Vrolijkheid[26] became operational during 1964 and arrangements were well underway to establish a hound depot at Adelaide in the Eastern Cape Region early during 1965.

Predators in the immediate vicinity of Vrolijkheid became scarce; therefore, the young hounds had to be taken further afield for necessary hunt training exercises. Hunts were conducted in the Bredasdorp, Swellendam, Caledon, Bonnievale, Montagu and Ceres districts, accounting for the killing of 17 black-backed jackals, 5 caracals (still referred to as lynx in the old reports), 5 Cape foxes and 5 genets.

The coyote getter proved to be the most successful method for the control of black-backed jackals and vagrant dogs. In order to conduct field tests on different improved baits and the efficacy of the cyanide cartridges (shells) used, new areas further removed from Vrolijkheid had to be found where black-backed jackals were present and hounds were not being used for hunting. It was established that black-backed jackals would activate (pull) coyote getters throughout the year, but apparently showed preference for baits during different seasons of the year. It also seemed that cyanide cartridges (shells) deteriorated with age and exposure to the elements (heat and moisture) under field conditions, therefore, only the newer type of cyanide cartridges (shells) were used. Apparently, coyote getters had killed more black-backed jackals than the actual number of carcasses recovered where good pulls had been recorded.

Personnel at Vrolijkheid conducted field trials with coyote getters in the districts of Calvinia, Bonnievale, the Nuy area, Montagu, Riversdale and Robertson: 223 coyote getters were set, of which 67 were activated (pulled), resulting in 36 carcasses (11 black-backed jackals/4 vagrant dogs/9 Cape foxes/12 yellow mongooses/1 ostrich) being found.

It was suspected that the actual kills were more, because some carcasses may have been removed undetected to sell the skins, specifically in the case of black-backed jackals for which there was a demand for the skins.

[24] Executive Committee Resolution No. 2/16.1.1974. Re Memo. B.12/1/2/1 of 20.11.1973.
[25] 1 hectare = 1.1672697560406 morgen
[26] Anonymous, 1964. Predator Control Research Farm, Vrolijkheid. Department of Nature Conservation. Report No. 21. pp. 58-66.

Version 5.0 - P.J. de Waal - Version 5.0

The success of the coyote getter as control method was demonstrated by results reported by two Divisional Council hunters. Over a period of seven months in the Oudtshoorn area, 656 coyote getters were set of which 239 were activated (pulled). The hunter recovered 121 black-backed jackals, 12 vagrant dogs, 77 mongooses and 2 genets; and over a period of five months in the Kimberley area; another hunter recovered 141 black-backed jackals, 3 Cape foxes, 11 vagrant dogs and 2 hyaenas (presumably brown hyaenas).

The staff at Vrolijkheid sold 930 coyote getters, 4 900 cyanide cartridges (shells) and 467 jars (0.45 kg) of specially prepared scented bait (total value R2 505).

Training of hunters in the latest methods of predator control and nature conservation had become an important and regular feature of the services provided at Vrolijkheid. These included lectures, demonstrations and practical work on hound welfare and training, both at the kennels and in the field. Due to demand, regular courses were presented in May and September each year and priority was given to Divisional Council hunters from the Cape Province, Departments of Nature Conservation and other government departments.

The distribution of leopard and caracal in the Cape Province was investigated by with questionnaires issued to Divisional Councils, farmers' associations and other interested bodies.

The visitor's book was signed by 268 individuals, among other by visitors from all four Provinces, Namibia (erstwhile South West Africa), Zimbabwe (erstwhile Southern Rhodesia), Zambia (erstwhile Northern Rhodesia) and a visitor from overseas.

The detailed report provided information on the research projects conducted under field conditions and the laboratory by the Professional Officers, Dr. J.L. Dickson and Dr. K.C.A. Schulz, assisted by the Predator Control Inspector, Mr. D.E. Compion. Thallium sulphate and sodium monofluoroacetate (Compound 1080) were specifically mentioned. Research results showed the potency of sodium monofluoroacetate differed considerably; it was 100, 17 and 10 times more potent for the dog, black-backed jackal and dassie (rock hyrax) respectively than for the baboon. The fatal dose for a 6.75 kg (15 lbs) black-backed jackal was 4.0 mg sodium monofluoroacetate and 232 mg sodium monofluoroacetate for a 22.5 kg (50 lbs) baboon. It was concluded that sodium monofluoroacetate (Compound 1080) "*was a most effective poison for destroying carnivores such as vagrant dogs and black-backed jackals.*"

1965/66 – Orange Free State Province

Until 1965, three large hunt associations ["*Sentrajag*", "*Noord-Oos Vrystaat*" and Harrismith "*Jagverenigings*"] were operating in the Orange Free State Province[27] and subsidised by the Provincial Administration. Another 34 smaller, but private hunt associations were also operating in other areas of the Orange Free State Province.

The Provincial Administration Orange Free State (PAO) considered a proposal of the Department of Nature Conservation (Memo. B. 2/2/19 of 13 April 1965) and, on 22 April 1965[28], resolved to continue paying subsidies from 1 April 1965 for another nine months to hunt associations on the basis of R6 000 per year for every 1 million morgen (856 700 ha), and thereafter proportionally for every completed 500 000 morgen (428 350 ha); the basis for paying subsidies after 31 December 1965 was to be reconsidered at a later stage.

[27] Project N7/7/5 Unpublished Report May 1988, Directorate Environment and Nature Conservation, Orange Free State Provincial Administration.
[28] File N12/7/4 - Executive Committee Resolution No. 589/22.4.65.

Version 5.0 - HO de Ward - Version 5.0

In terms of section 4 of the Vermin Extermination Ordinance, 1953, as amended by Ordinance No. 19 of 1965, the Administrator of the Orange Free State Province cancelled by proclamation[29] from 31 December 1965 the registration of all hunt clubs in the following 36 magisterial districts: Bethlehem, Bloemfontein, Boshof, Bothaville, Brandfort, Bultfontein, Clocolan, Dewetsdorp, Ficksburg, Fouriesburg, Frankfort, Harrismith, Heilbron, Hoopstad, Koppies, Kroonstad, Ladybrand, Lindley, Marquard, Odendaalsrus, Parys, Reitz, Sasolburg, Senekal, Thaba 'Nchu, Theunissen, Ventersburg, Viljoenskroon, Virginia, Vrede, Vredefort, Wepener, Welkom, Wesselsbron, Winburg and Zastron.

In terms of section 3 of the Vermin Extermination Ordinance, 1953, as amended by Ordinance No. 19 of 1965, the Administrator of the Orange Free State Province approved by proclamation[30] from 1 January 1966 the Orange Free State Vermin Control and Wild Life Protection Association ["Oranje-Vrystaatse Ongediertebeheer- en Wildbewaringsvereniging" - commonly known as Oranjejag], in the area falling within the following 36 magisterial districts: Bethlehem, Bloemfontein, Boshof, Bothaville, Brandfort, Bultfontein, Clocolan, Dewetsdorp, Ficksburg, Fouriesburg, Frankfort, Harrismith, Heilbron, Hoopstad, Koppies, Kroonstad, Ladybrand, Lindley, Marquard, Odendaalsrus, Parys, Reitz, Sasolburg, Senekal, Thaba 'Nchu, Theunissen, Ventersburg, Viljoenskroon, Virginia, Vrede, Vredefort, Wepener, Welkom, Wesselsbron, Winburg and Zastron.

These 36 magisterial districts were to the northeast of a general line, extending from Boshof in the north-west to Zastron in the southeast of the Orange Free State Province.

1966 – Cape Province

The hound breeding and training activities of the Department of Nature Conservation at Vrolijkheid were extended to a second site at Adelaide (59 ha) in the Eastern Cape Region of the erstwhile Cape Province.

The Division Problem Animal Control of the Department of Nature Conservation became fully functional with the Predator Research Farm Vrolijkheid as headquarters and the hound training station at Adelaide as sub-station in the Eastern Cape Region. Mr. D.E. Compion was the Senior Hound master at Vrolijkheid and Mr. L. Petzer was the Responsible Hound master at Adelaide. The services provided in the Cape Province included research on problem animal control and services provided on demand for specific problems, training of hunters and providing well-trained hounds to hunt clubs.

Dr. J.L. Dickson[31], a veterinarian and Senior Professional Officer at Vrolijkheid, retired on 31 December 1966. He joined the Department on 15 January 1962 and had since played an important role in developing Vrolijkheid. The good reputation of the facility was attributed to his dedication. He was also responsible for the early development of the Adelaide sub-station and organised the hunter courses that played an important role in the technical assistance rendered by Vrolijkheid.

Problem animal control in the vast geographical area of the Cape Province could only have been effective if hunt clubs in the different areas functioned under supervision and guidance of the Department. Hunt clubs were inspected and R43 855 was paid as subsidies to clubs.

[29] Official Gazette, Province of the Orange Free State, No. 57. Friday, 24th December, 1965. Proclamation No. 267 of 1965.
[30] Official Gazette, Province of the Orange Free State, No. 57. Friday, 24th December, 1965. Proclamation No. 268 of 1965.
[31] Anonymous, 1966. Afdeling Ongediertebeheer. Roofdierproefplaas, Vrolijkheid. Department of Nature Conservation. Report No. 23. pp. 82-104.

Version 5.0 - H.O. de Waal - Version 5.0

Passionate pleas were made for a balanced and scientific approach to mitigate the effects of predation; attempts at blanket removal of predators often lead to unintended consequences such as sharp increases in the populations of rodents. There was a need for research to continue, a balanced scientific approach to control animal populations and liaison with other departments and institutions.

The most severe drought in 10 years had prevailed and impeded activities at Vrolijkheid. Black-backed jackals were scarce near Robertson; therefore the hounds were taken to the Worcester district for much needed hunt training exercises. Cooperation between local hunt clubs and Vrolijkheid was excellent. Training hunts were conducted at the request and with the cooperation of the following hunt clubs: Robertson, Agterkliphoogte, Bonnievale, Kliprivier, Stormsvlei and Swellendam. During these hunts, the following animals were killed: 16 black-backed jackals, 3 caracals, 2 Cape foxes and 2 African wildcats.

The endurance, smelling and hunting ability of the hounds were excellent. If weather conditions permitted, they would follow a scent unwavering until they killed the prey. The demand for hounds declined, probably because of the increased use of coyote getters; only 32 hounds were sold. Based on experience with specific breeds during hunts, changes were made in the hound-breeding programme.

The black-backed jackal population became smaller in an area and some individuals apparently adapted or became shy and activated coyote getters without being killed. A change in the composition of the bait was considered. Scent-lure prepared at Vrolijkheid was successful in attracting caracals to steel cage traps.

In total, 1 049 coyote getters, 5 818 cyanide cartridges (shells) and 392 bait flasks (0.45 kg) were sold.

Coyote getters were also sold to authorities in Zimbabwe (erstwhile Southern Rhodesia), Natal Parks Board and the Agricultural Research Farm at Keetmanshoop, Namibia (erstwhile South West Africa).

Personnel at Vrolijkheid conducted field trials with coyote getters in the districts of Robertson, Vryburg, Swellendam, Montagu, Piketberg and Bonnievale: 235 coyote getters were set of which 53 were activated (pulled), resulting in 36 carcasses (8 black-backed jackals/3 vagrant dogs/4 Cape foxes/1 caracal/14 Cape grey mongooses/3 yellow mongooses/2 pigs/1 crow) being found.

Again, it was suspected that the actual kills were more, because some carcasses may have been removed undetected to sell the skins, specifically in the case of black-backed jackals for which there was a demand for the skins.

Information provided by a hunter from Barkly West Divisional Council was used to demonstrate the effectiveness of coyote getters. During a period of 23 months a total of 279 black-backed jackals, 35 vagrant dogs and 175 mongooses were killed; an average of about 13 black-backed jackals and vagrant dogs per month for two of the predators that were known to be responsible for sheep losses.

Some cyanide cartridges (shells) malfunctioned, apparently because of a combination of high heat and moisture. The defect of the defect cyanide cartridges (shells) was reported and samples were returned to the manufacturer in the USA.

Version 5.0 - HD de Waal - Version 5.0

Four training courses were conducted at Vrolijkheid and all participants were issued with competency certificates; basic techniques and safety measure could be demonstrated easily, but practical use of the equipment was needed over time to establish real skills and competence. During courses, lectures were also presented on the habits of problem animals, legislation regarding problem animal control and the use of poison. One hunter attended a hound training and management course.

Subsidised hunt clubs were inspected in the districts of Agterkliphoogte, Clanwilliam, Sandveld, Bredasdorp, Piketberg and Maclear.

More than 220 persons visited Vrolijkheid. In September 1966 a group of 70 Members of the Provincial Council and their spouses, accompanied by Mr. J.C. Heunis, MEC: CPA and Mr. F. Jooste, Chairman of the Provincial Council, visited Vrolijkheid. They were impressed with the different activities at the facility, including a demonstration of a simulated or mock hound hunt by dragging a mock prey along a wire line.

The report provided information on general and more specific research topics, including field trials and experimentation in the laboratory with baits for different problem animals, the feeding habits of problem animals and lethal poison doses.

Mr. L. Petzer, the Responsible Hound Master at Adelaide[32] became resident on site from 1 January 1966. The first batch of 12 fox hounds, a greyhound and two fox terriers arrived on 23 March 1966 from Vrolijkheid and more groups of hounds arrived on 9 June (15), 10 October (4) and 17 December (17) 1966. A group of six hounds were accepted as a gift from a local farmer on 13 December 1966. The hounds had to acclimatise in the new environment and its rough terrain with steep rocks and dense thickets. Mr. Petzer was commended for his good houndmastership; in the course of 147 days of hunt training, only one hound had been lost.

The prevailing drought often prevented effective hunt training opportunities for the hounds and when the hounds had to stay in their kennels, the personnel conducted excellent field trials with coyote getters. In the period April to December 1966, a total of 206 coyote getters were set of which 109 were activated (pulled), resulting in 83 carcasses (30 black-backed jackals/1 vagrant dog/14 Cape foxes/25 marsh mongooses/6 genets/7 yellow mongooses) being found.

Again, it was suspected that more animals had actually been killed, because some carcasses may have been removed undetected to sell the skins, specifically in the case of black-backed jackals for which there was a demand for the skins.

The Administrator of the Cape Province officially opened the Hound Training Station at Adelaide on 14 October 1966. It was attended by 130 guests, as well as Mr. J.C. Heunis, MEC: CPA, and the Director Nature Conservation, Provincial Administration. Messrs. Compion and Petzer gave the guests a demonstration of a simulated or mock hound hunt by dragging a mock prey along a wire line.

1966/67 – Orange Free State Province

In terms of section 3 of the Vermin Extermination Ordinance, 1953 (Ordinance No. 8 of 1953), as amended by Ordinance No. 19 of 1965, the Administrator of the Orange Free State

[32] Anonymous, 1966. Afdeling Ongediertebeheer. Hondeafrigtingstasie, Adelaide. Department of Nature Conservation. Report No. 23. pp. 105-106.

Version 5.0 - HO du Weed - Version 5.0

Province registered by proclamation[33] from 1 April 1967 an area, additional to the original area of the Orange Free State Vermin Control and Wild Life Protection Association (Oranjejag), constituting the following 12 magisterial districts: Bethulie, Edenburg, Fauresmith, Jacobsdal, Jagersfontein, Koffiefontein, Petrusburg, Philippolis, Reddersburg, Rouxville, Smithfield and Trompsburg.

Inclusion of these 12 magisterial districts, located in the south-western part of the Province, mandated Oranjejag to operate its predation control activities across all 48 districts in the Orange Free State Province.

The PAO undertook to contribute annually a maximum amount of R70 000 to Oranjejag[34]. In the currency of the day, this was a substantial amount of money.

1969/70 – Cape Province

Mr. K.J. van Rensburg was appointed as the Responsible Officer for Vrolijkheid[35]. This organisational change allowed Prof. K.C.A. Schultz, who had acted in this position for more than a year, to concentrate on problem animal control research, which was his primary responsibility.

After completing a very successful extended study tour to the UK where he worked at the Wilton Hunt Club in England and the Eglington Hunt Club in Scotland, Mr. J.C.R. Joubert, a Vermin Control Inspector resumed duties at Vrolijkheid. During his study tour, he also visited 15 other hunt clubs in England (7), Scotland (5) and Ireland (3). Useful practical experience was gained during the extended study tour to the UK.

Mr. Chris Stuart was appointed in March 1969 as nature conservation officer at Vrolijkheid. In their lifetimes, Chris Stuart and his wife Tilde Stuart, made valuable contributions to conservation and an understanding of wildlife in South Africa, specifically regarding the predators implicated for predation on livestock in South Africa; and further in Africa[36].

Because of ongoing research and improvement of control methods during field tests, the activities of the Division Problem Animal Control were successfully adopted, implemented and extended. Hunt clubs and farmers relied increasingly on technical support and advice regarding specific problems. Development of more effective methods of predator control, allowed a single hunter to service a larger area and more Divisional Councils were prepared to employ full-time hunters. This resulted in better and closer cooperation between Divisional Council hunt clubs and the Division Problem Animal Control. In total, 61 hunt clubs were inspected during 1969.

Poor climatic conditions during a drought prevented the hounds from being taken on hunts and they were exercised daily for about four hours at Vrolijkheid. The hounds were also released in open yards next to the kennels to release their tension and reduce fighting, as well as allowing easier cleaning of the kennels.

Version 5.0 . HO de Waal. Version 5.0

[33] Extraordinary Official Gazette, Province of the Orange Free State, No. 11. Friday, 3rd March, 1967. Proclamation No. 46 of 1967.
[34] Executive Committee Resolution No. 682/22.5.67.
[35] Anonymous, 1969/70. Afdeling Ongediertebeheer. Departement van Natuurbewaring. Verslag No. 26. pp. 134-149.
[36] Stuart, Chris & Stuart, Tilde, 2000. A field guide to the tracks & signs of southern and east African Wildlife. Struik Publishers, Cape Town.

Except for the hottest summer months, Vrolijkheid was ideal to train and exercise hounds. The wildlife present on site offered ideal opportunities to teach young hounds to refrain from chasing antelopes.

Predators were scarce near Vrolijkheid, therefore hunts with the hound packs were organised further away in the Divisional Council areas of Robertson, Montagu, Ladismith, Swellendam and Kenhardt.

Specific needs for research on rock hyraxes were also provided by hunting with Jack Russel terriers near Steytlerville, Montagu, Graaff-Reinet and Clanwilliam. During these hunts, 16 black-backed jackals, 3 Cape foxes, 4 caracals, 5 African wildcats, 1 leopard and 153 rock hyraxes were killed. Two caracals were also caught with foothold traps. The rock hyraxes were caught to study their ecology and biology and to improve control measures.

A high standard and quality of hound breeding was maintained; the animals were fed a balanced diet of cooked dog food and the daily ration for a 27 kg dog was 0.9 kg. The hounds bred and trained at Vrolijkheid constituted ideal hunt packs comprising fox hounds, greyhounds, Jack Russel-terriers, fox terriers and different cross breeds.

With the exception of two hunt clubs that were inspected from Vrolijkheid and where black-backed jackals were still present, coyote getters and hounds were used. The hunts clubs that were inspected for a few successive years have made good progress in controlling problem animals. In general, the numbers of the relatively harmless Cape foxes, aardwolves and bat-eared foxes increased.

Specific mention was made of the achievement of a hunter in the Namaqualand Divisional Council: only coyote getters were used and on average 23 black-backed jackals were killed during a 10-month period (January to October); during one month, 43 black-backed jackals were killed and two caracals were killed with coyote getters.

Personnel at Vrolijkheid conducted field trials with coyote getters in the districts of Robertson, Gouda, Ladismith, Worcester and Montagu: 125 coyote getters were set of which 51 were activated (pulled) and 33 carcasses (17 black-backed jackals/1 Cape fox/1 vagrant dog/11 Cape grey mongooses/1 yellow mongoose) were found.

A process was started to produce cyanide cartridges (shells) locally in South Africa, but it created concern regarding the distances travelled by black-backed jackals before they died. Modifications were made to the cyanide cartridges (shells) and it was evaluated.

Personnel at Vrolijkheid conducted field trials in the districts of George and Swellendam with cyanide cartridges (shells) which had been manufactured in South Africa: 31 coyote getters were set of which 25 were activated (pulled), resulting in 8 carcasses (3 Cape foxes/4 Cape grey mongooses/1 yellow mongoose) being found. The cyanide cartridges (shells) were also tested with satisfactory results at Vrolijkheid.

Training courses were conducted at Vrolijkheid in the use of coyote getters.

In total, 1 117 complete coyote getters, 7 450 cyanide cartridges (shells), coyote getter spare parts (cartridge holders and firing units) and 201 kg bait were sold.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

During 1969, Vrolijkheid was visited by 139 persons, including visitors from the USA, England, Zimbabwe (erstwhile Southern Rhodesia) and Malawi. Mr. C.J. Heunis (an MEC: CPA) and Mr. P. Palm (Member of the Provincial Council) visited Vrolijkheid on 8 October 1969.

Guests of the Department of Nature Conservation were also received at Vrolijkheid: Mr. J. Welch, Director of the Wildlife Research Station at Denver, Colorado, USA; Mr. A.D. Butcher, Director of Fisheries and Wildlife Services, Victoria, Australia; Mr. P. le Roux, Director of Nature Conservation, Orange Free State Province, Bloemfontein; and Mr. Ian Player of the Natal Board for Conservation of Parks, Game and Fish.

The hound training station at Adelaide (established in October 1966) was fully functional and has become the centre of problem animal control in the Eastern Cape Region. Hounds have been bred, trained and sold to hunt clubs. Smaller, faster dogs were preferred in the dense thickets of the Eastern Cape Region; therefore, a breeding initiative for such a type of hunt hound was started. During training hunts, the hounds killed 9 bush pigs, 16 black-backed jackals, 1 caracal and 5 spotted genets.

Apparently, hunting was more effective when hunters hunted in pairs with the hounds and kept contact in the dense thickets.

A diet consisting of 0.45 kg meat, 0.45 kg vegetables and 0.45 kg balanced food yielded good results.

Good results were obtained with coyote getters and the bait prepared at Adelaide: 520 coyote getters were set of which 289 were activated (pulled), resulting in finding the carcasses of 62 black-backed jackals, 28 Cape foxes, 8 vagrant dogs, 18 marsh mongooses, 12 mongooses, 21 genets, 6 Cape porcupines, 1 aardwolf, 2 bush pigs and 1 leguaan.

Training courses in problem animal control were presented at Adelaide and during the practical use of coyote getters, 19 black-backed jackal carcasses were retrieved. Lectures were presented on nature conservation, research conducted at Vrolijkheid and the ordinances pertaining to problem animal control. General information was provided on the procedures to establish hunt clubs, to obtain subsidies and placing orders for problem animal control equipment by Divisional Councils.

Personnel from Adelaide inspected 25 hunt clubs.

During 1969, Adelaide was visited by 205 persons; they were impressed with the work conducted and the appearance of the facility.

1969/70 – Orange Free State Province

Claims for subsidies of R17 500 each for the periods 1 April to 30 June 1969, 1 July to 30 September 1969 and 1 October to 31 December 1969 were submitted by Oranjejag and paid by the Administration on 16 April, 25 July and 19 September 1969[37]. An advance of R2 500 was also paid on 19 September 1969 for the claim for the fourth period from 1 January to 31 March 1970; the balance of R15 000 was paid on 4 December 1969. The total subsidy paid to Oranjejag for the 1969/70 financial year was R70 000.

1970/71 - Orange Free State Province

[37] Executive Committee Resolutions No. 559/6.8.1962 and No. 682/22.5.1967.

Version 5.0 - HD de Waal - Version 5.0

In a letter dated 18 November 1970[38], the Cape Department of Nature Conservation referred to a general request from the Orange Free State Department of Nature Conservation for a small number of hunting dogs. It had been viewed favourably by its "Tecnac" and advised that for consideration the Orange Free State Province's Department of Nature Conservation must submit by 28 February 1971 a formal requirement for dogs. On 4 December 1970, the Department confirmed that the Director of Oranjejag has responded that they were breeding their own hounds; thus, there was no need for acquiring any hunting hounds from the Cape Province in 1971.

Claims for subsidies of R17 500 each for the periods 1 April to 30 June 1970, 1 July to 30 September 1970, 1 October to 31 December 1970 and 1 January to 31 March 1971 were submitted by Oranjejag and three claims were paid by the Administration respectively on 10 April, about 6 July and 13 October 1970. Proof of payment for the fourth claim could not be sourced, but it appears the total subsidy paid to Oranjejag for the 1970/71 financial year was again R70 000.

The Executive Committee of the PAO considered a memorandum of the Secretariat and resolved[39] to advance R30 000 of the annual subsidy for the 1971/72 financial year (1 April 1971 to 31 March 1972) to Oranjejag. The recommendation was based on some serious considerations and financial implications for Oranjejag, namely:

- It was estimated by Oranjejag that compulsory subscription from its members (about 21 000) will result in an income of R60 000 to R70 000 per year. Because of resistance to the compulsory subscription by landowners, this target was not realised. In 1968, only R45 785 was received as subscriptions with a shortfall of R36 941. In 1969, only R46 878 was received as subscriptions with a shortfall of R12 492. Therefore, Oranjejag did not meet its financial obligations towards the Provincial Administration, namely an outstanding loan of R20 000 to make improvements on the small farm Bathurst (to the east of Bloemfontein) and an advance of R25 500 in 1966 to get Oranjejag started.
- The Executive Committee approved that outstanding subscriptions may be recovered through civil litigations; an amount of R17 090 was recovered at a cost of R4 724 for legal expenses. It was not certain how much was still outstanding because the addresses of about 2 000 owners could not be found.
- The subsidy of R70 000 for the 1970/71 financial year was already paid in full, but it still left Oranjejag with an overdraft of R9 080 on 31 December 1971, three months before the end of the financial year.
- Reference was made to the envisaged amendment of the Ordinance on the Extermination of Vermin, No. 11 of 1967, whereby the system of compulsory membership would be replaced with a voluntary system. This envisaged amendment in membership created uncertainty and affected negatively the ability of Oranjejag to levy and collect subscriptions, specifically during the first few months of 1971.
- It was recommended to advance R30 000 to Oranjejag on its annual subsidy for the 1971/72 financial year and the situation would be reviewed at the end of the 1971/72 financial year.

In another letter dated 11 February 1971[40] to the Provincial Accountant, the PAO provided additional supportive justification for the request for an early advance of a subsidy and its obligation to Oranjejag. The letter also confirmed the existence of three hunt associations ["*Sentrajag*", "*Noord-Oos Vrystaat*" and Harrismith "*Jagverenigings*"] prior to 1 January 1966

[38] Letters on File N. 2/7/4
[39] Executive Committee Resolution No. 176/9.2.71 re Memo. B.12/1/2/1 of 28.01.1971.
[40] File N12/7/4 - letter B.12/1/2/1 of 11 February 1971; signed by the Under Secretary, Secretariat of the Orange Free State Provincial Administration.

Version 5.0 HG de Waal, Version 5.0

and which were officially subsidised. When these three hunt associations amalgamated by proclamation to form a single hunt association in the Province, namely Oranjejag, the latter became eligible for the subsidies due for the period 1 January to 31 March 1966.

1971/72 – Orange Free State Province

The Executive Committee of the PAO was reminded by the Secretariat[41] about an amendment of the Ordinance on the Extermination of Vermin, No. 11 of 1967, whereby the system of compulsory membership had been replaced from 1 April 1971 with a voluntary system. The financial difficulties experienced by Oranjejag in collecting subscriptions were explained in detail. The Executive Committee resolved that the amounts of R27 950, R30 000 and R20 000, as well as the interest accrued on the latter amount, will not be claimed from Oranjejag. The resolution also imposed specific restrictions on the property which was to be registered on the title deed for Bathurst (a small farm to the east of Bloemfontein which was bought for R12 300 on 15 December 1964 by "*Sentrajag*"; the latter being an old hunt association which has been dissolved and amalgamated with Oranjejag), namely:

- it may not be leased or dealt with in any other way without the consent of the Administration;
- ownership of the property may not be transferred to anybody except the Administration; and
- when Oranjejag is dissolved, ownership of Bathurst must revert to the Administration.

On 1 November 1971, Mr. J.S. Hugo resigned as Director of Oranjejag[42] and succeeded by Mrs. Esther Brand in a temporary capacity as acting Director. The Department of Nature Conservation employed Mr. Hugo.

1972/73 – Orange Free State Province

Mrs. Esther Brand was apparently appointed sometime before 3 July 1972 as the Director of Oranjejag.

1972/73 – Cape Province

The training of hounds proceeded well at Vrolijkheid[43] and because of the small number of hounds in stock, the younger and older hounds were trained together, and the younger hounds learnt to hunt much faster.

Hunts were conducted with hounds in the districts of Robertson, Swellendam, Barrydale, Riversdale and Ladismith: 12 black-backed jackals, 1 caracal, 3 African wildcats and 257 rock hyraxes were killed.

Personnel at Vrolijkheid conducted trials with coyote getters in the districts of Robertson, Clanwilliam, Montagu, Ladismith, Riversdale and Worcester: 218 coyote getters were set and 116 were activated (pulled), resulting in retrieval of the carcasses of 13 black-backed jackals, 27 vagrant dogs, 25 Cape foxes, 3 bat-eared foxes, 12 cape grey mongooses, 5 genets, 1 Cape porcupine, 4 crows and 1 domestic cat. During the year, 8 caracals were caught in cage traps.

The Departmental policy aimed to stop the use of all poison and approval in this regard was requested from the Executive Committee.

[41] Executive Committee Resolution No. 1055/26.10.71 re Memo. B.12/1/2/1 of 21 October 1971.
[42] Secretariat of the Administration to Finances - Memo B12/1/2/1 of 13 January 1972.
[43] Anonymous, 1972/73. Probleemdierbeheer. Kaapse Departement van Natuurbewaring. Verslag No. ??. pp. 34-36.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

The sales of problem animal control equipment included 1 280 complete coyote getters, 11 000 cyanide cartridges (shells), 316 coyote getter firing units, 568 cartridge holders, 520 flasks (0.45 kg) of scent bait and 48 setting pliers.

A property of 6 ha was bought at Hartswater by the Department for developing a base for the problem animal control personnel in the Northern Cape Region.

The main activities of staff at Adelaide Nature Conservation Station were setting coyote getters, inspections of hunt clubs and advisory services. During training hunts, the hounds killed a total of 27 bush pigs, 12 black-backed jackals, 6 caracals and 1 African wildcat.

In total, 40 hunt clubs were inspected. The list of animals killed by the hunt clubs included 64 black-backed jackals, 14 vagrant dogs, 15 Cape foxes, 47 meerkat, 21 genets, 1 bat-eared fox, 2 crows, 1 leguaan, 11 mongooses and 1 Cape porcupine.

1973/74 – Orange Free State Province

Based on a report by the Departmental Committee regarding Oranjejag, the Executive Committee of the PAO resolved[44]: "*That Oranjejag will be subsidised by R100 000 per year from 1 April 1973, subject to regular evaluation of the subsidy and taking into account the association's income from subscriptions and other sources*." The resolution also laid down a new scale of subscriptions payable depending on the size of farms, thus in effect doubling the existing subscription fees. The Division Nature Conservation was also ordered to conduct research regarding vermin control ("*ongediertebestryding*") in cooperation with Oranjejag.

From 1 April 1973 the PAO started paying the revised annual subsidy of R100 000 in four quarterly tranches of R25 000 each for Oranjejag.

1974/75 – Orange Free State Province

The first of four quarterly tranches of R25 000 each was paid as subsidy to Oranjejag on 2 April 1974.

The Secretariat informed the Executive Committee of the PAO about Oranjejag's request for an additional R40 000 for the 1974/75 financial year; the following background information[45] was provided in a memorandum:

- The responsibility for the extermination of vermin (*"uitroeiing van ongediertes"*) was transferred to the Province by Act 10 of 1913 (superseded by Act 38 of 1945) and Proclamation No. 107 of 1914. Unlike the procedures implemented for other responsibilities, the Administration did not create a departmental organisation to exterminate vermin.
- The erstwhile smaller hunt associations and the three large hunt associations could not handle the vermin problem effectively. Therefore, Oranjejag was established by legislation to tackle vermin eradication in the Province in a well-planned and organised manner from 1 January 1966.
- The situation was reviewed during 1970 by considering several options, including the possibility that the Administration provide the service itself. It was decided to retain Oranjejag, but replace the system of compulsory membership with voluntary membership.
- Since 1 April 1971, when voluntary subscription was introduced, the membership of Oranjejag and its income from subscriptions increased slightly[46].

[44] Executive Committee Resolution No. 2/16.1.1974 re Memo. B.12/1/2/1 of 20.11.1973.
[45] Executive Committee Resolution No. 65/24.2.1975 re Memo. B.12/1/2/1 of 4 February 1975.
[46] Membership of Oranjejag

Version 5.0 – HG de Waal, Version 5.0

- Notwithstanding efforts by the management of Oranjejag to cut expenses, it was not possible to meet obligations from subscriptions and a R70 000 subsidy from the Administration. Therefore, in the 1971/72 and 1972/73 financial years the Administration provided Oranjejag with an additional R20 000.
- The situation was reviewed again at the end of 1973 and as recommended by a departmental committee, the Executive Committee of the Administration resolved: "*That Oranjejag will be subsidised by R100 000 per year from 1 April 1973, subject to regular evaluation of the subsidy and taking into account the association's income from subscriptions and other sources*." A new scale of annual subscriptions, based on the size of farms, was also approved.

After duly considering the memorandum, the Executive Committee resolved on 24 February 1975 to allocate an additional amount of R40 000 to Oranjejag for the 1974/75 financial year.

1974/75 – Cape Province

Experience showed that the control of problem animals was achieved most efficiently when properly trained professional hunters were employed[47]. With this in mind a number of Divisional Councils in the Cape Province were advised to appoint full-time hunters, but the response was disappointing.

Collection of data on the problem animal situation in the Cape Province continued. Monthly reports were submitted by 22 hunt clubs from 11 Divisional Councils in the Western Cape Region. In the Divisional Councils where those clubs operated, 1 073 small livestock had been killed by problem animals. It was noted in the report: "*Hunters in turn accounted for 491 problem animals, thus achieving a high degree of control.*"

The sales of problem animal control equipment during 1974 (numbers in brackets for 1973) included 9 000 (13 325) cyanide cartridges (shells), 1 399 (529) coyote getter firing units, 1 775 (911) cartridge holders, 680 (953) flasks (0.45 kg) of scent bait and 51 (89) setting pliers.

Staff at Vrolijkheid conducted problem animal control activities: 265 coyote getters were set of which 165 were activated (pulled), resulting in the killing of 101 animals (20 problem animals and 57 non-problem animals).

Staff at Adelaide Nature Conservation Station experienced considerable problems with the functioning of coyote getters and cyanide cartridges (shells). Trials were conducted to determine the effectiveness of different types of coyote getter cartridges (shells). However, because of changes in personnel, a full programme of field trials could not be carried out.

The huge size of the Northern Cape Region (270 000 km^2) and personnel shortages meant that nature conservation generally developed slower than in the two other regions, namely the Eastern and Western Cape Regions.

Financial year	Members	Subscriptions (R)
1971/72	4 020	24 370
1972/73	5 006	29 340
1973/74	5 200	31 420
1974/75	5 321	33 335

[47] Anonymous, 1974-1975. Vrolijkheid Nature Conservation Station, Robertson. Cape Department of Nature Conservation and Museum Services. Report No. 31. pp. 31-35.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

Black-backed jackals and caracals caused most damage to livestock on farms. The coyote getter was the most successful and economical method of controlling black-backed jackals, while cage traps proved to be effective for caracal. An advantage of the cage trap was that farmers could use it with a minimum of experience and training.

Personnel at Hartswater conducted problem animal control activities: 282 coyote getters were set of which 208 were activated (pulled), resulting in the killing of 110 animals (79 problem animals and 31 non-problem animals).

1975/76 – Cape Province

The sales of problem animal control equipment during 1975[48] included 10 440 cyanide cartridges (shells), 1 513 coyote getter firing units, 1 315 cartridge holders, 863 staples, 23 setting pliers and 995 flasks (0.45 kg) of scent bait.

During hunts with hounds in the areas of Swellendam, Riversdale and Barrydale, 23 black-backed jackals and 3 caracals were killed.

Coyote getters and cyanide cartridges (shells) were tested and 201 coyote getters were set of which 110 were activated (pulled), resulting in the killing of 89 animals (31 problem animals and 58 non-problem animals).

In total, 17 caracals were caught with cage traps.

At this point in the annual reporting, the detail contained in the 1975/76 Annual Report of the Department improved markedly compared to previous annual reports.

A total of 27 hunt clubs was inspected from Vrolijkheid and according to the monthly reports of the clubs a total of 1 180 small livestock was killed in the Cape Province by problem animals, including vagrant dogs. Hunters of these hunt clubs killed 154 black-backed jackals (132 – coyote getters/20 – hounds/2 foothold traps[49]), 121 baboons (114 – coyote getters/7 - foothold traps), 284 caracals (80 – cage traps/117 – hounds/87 – foothold traps), 47 rock hyraxes (foothold traps), 66 vagrant dogs (50 – coyote getters/10 – cage traps/6 – foothold traps), 103 Cape foxes (58 - coyote getters/31 – hounds/14 - foothold traps), 57 bat-eared foxes (29 - coyote getters/21 – hounds/7 foothold traps), 81 mongooses (42 - coyote getters/39 - hounds), 29 several species of wildcats (7 – cage traps/22 - hounds), 4 leopards (2 – cage traps/2 – foothold traps), 20 Cape porcupines (6 – cage traps/14 – foothold traps) and 7 honey badgers (foothold traps). The 367 animals killed or caught were accounted for by coyote getters = 179, cage traps = 25, hounds = 113 and foothold traps = 50.

Technical advice and support were provided at 20 meetings of farmers' associations and Divisional Councils. Attending such meetings created a better understanding of the activities of Vrolijkheid and improved the relations with the farming community.

Considerable success was achieved by catching different problem animal species with cage traps: 75 vervet monkeys, 66 baboons, 12 Cape porcupines, 3 leopards, 2 bush pigs, 1 caracal and 1 marsh mongoose. Another 40 baboons were poisoned with Telodrin, a bush pig was caught in a game net and another bush pig was shot.

[48] Anonymous, 1975-1976. Vroijlikheid-Natuurbewaringstasie, Robertson. Cape Department of Nature Conservation and Museum Services. Report No. 32. pp. 23-38.
[49] The devices currently known as foothold traps were previously referred to as spring traps or gin traps.

Version 5.0 - H.O. de Waal - Version 5.0

The primary activities of staff at the Adelaide Nature Conservation Station were the training of problem animal control hunters and the breeding, training and selling of hounds to control problem animals. In total, 37 hunt clubs were inspected. Training courses were aimed at training Africans to hunt problem animals with hound packs and farmers to use both hounds and coyote getters. The demand for trained hounds was greater than what could be supplied.

During control operations with hounds, 20 black-backed jackals, 24 caracals and 21 bush pigs were killed.

The use of coyote getters to control problem animals was promoted: 803 coyote getters were set and 522 were activated (pulled), resulting in the killing of 117 animals (55 problem animals, 5 vagrant dogs and 57 non-problem animals).

1975/76 – Orange Free State Province

On 18 March 1976, the Executive Committee approved[50] an additional advance of R8 140 for Oranjejag. Justification for Oranjejag's request was that its membership declined to 4 970 during 1975/76. Although subscriptions received (R68 455.50) were still more than double compared to the previous year and despite Oranjejag making every effort to cut expenses, it could again not meet obligations from subscriptions and the Administration's subsidy of R100 000. Therefore, in the 1974/75 financial year the Administration subsidised Oranjejag with an additional R40 000. A recurring situation unfolded in the 1975/76 financial year and another shortfall was foreseen, primarily also because of legal costs (R4 308, farmers did not pay compulsory subscriptions), increased travelling costs (R4 341), dog food and diverse expenses (R700).

1976/77 – Cape Province

A part of Vrolijkheid, the farm of 1 827 ha near Robertson in the south-western Cape Province[51] and the research centre for problem animals and a centre for breeding and training of hunting hounds was converted into a reserve to conserve the local indigenous fauna and flora.

The Administrator appointed a committee to investigate the problem animal situation in the Cape Province; therefore, staff spent considerable time collecting information for the Committee on existing systems and methods of problem animal control.

Some protected species, specifically leopard also caused damage and had to be managed in the regions of Tulbagh and Ceres.

Monthly hunt reports were received from 25 hunt clubs; 386 hunts were conducted and 545 problem animals and 411 non-problem animals were killed, while in the area served by these hunt clubs 1 647 small livestock were reportedly killed by problem animals.

The sales of problem animal control equipment during 1976 included 9 185 cyanide cartridges (shells), 2 125 coyote getter firing units, 2 489 cartridge holders, 1 673 staples, 98 setting pliers and 1 361 flasks (0.45 kg) of scent bait.

Hunts to train hounds were carried out in the Divisional Council areas of Barrydale, Laingsburg, Riversdale, Montagu, Worcester and Ladismith: 34 black-backed jackals and 3 caracals were killed. Another 10 caracals were caught with cage traps. In field trials, 115 coyote getters were

[50] File N12/7/4 - Memo. B.12/1/2/1 of 16 March 1976.
[51] Anonymous, 1976-1977. Vroijlikheid-Natuurbewaringstasie, Robertson. Kaapse Departement van Natuurbewaring & Museumdienste. Verslag Nr. 33. pp. 32-45.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

set of which 88 were activated (pulled), resulting in the killing of 64 animals, namely 23 black-backed jackals, 4 Cape foxes, 12 bat-eared foxes, 3 meerkat, 16 mongooses, 5 vagrant dogs and 1 crow.

The Department encouraged farmers to conduct their own problem animal control and, as a result, fever animals were caught or killed during official activities, namely: 18 vervet monkeys, 56 baboons, 3 Cape porcupines, 2 leopards, 4 bush pigs and 2 caracals.

In trials conducted from Adelaide, 407 coyote getters were set of which 239 were activated (pulled), resulting in the killing of 71 animals, namely 19 black-backed jackals, 17 Cape foxes, 15 meerkat, 5 mongooses, 4 vagrant dogs, 4 crows and 7 small-spotted genets. In hunts with hounds, 13 black-backed jackals, 6 caracals and 10 bush pigs were killed.

Two additional personnel were employed at the Hartswater regional office to collect results on problem animal control and assist farmers with appropriate methods.

1977/78 – Cape Province

Mr. F. Vorster, Senior Professional Officer responsible for Problem Animal Control in the Cape Department of Nature Conservation and Museum Services[52] submitted a detailed report and historical perspective on the development of problem animal management in the Cape Province. In summary, he alluded to some historical events:

- The first recoded problems were experienced with wild animals destroying crops or killing livestock soon after the first European settlement in the Cape and the introduction of the first bounty system (June 1856) by Commander Jan van Riebeeck.
- The first ordinance on the extermination of vermin ("*ongedierte*") in the Cape Province came into effect in 1917 and, until 1957, three ordinances with 22 amendments were gazetted.
- In all earlier ordinances, provisions have been made to pay bounties for certain animals that were regarded as vermin and for subsidies to maintain packs of hunt hounds used in the extermination of vermin.
- Because of general dissatisfaction with the bounty system and large sums of money spent in the Cape Province on the extermination of vermin, it was decided in 1955 to appoint a committee to investigate the whole question of vermin extermination.
- Because of Committee's investigations and its recommendations, the Ordinance on the Extermination of Vermin, 1957 (Ordinance No. 26 of 1957) was promulgated on 11 October 1957.
- The Ordinance abolished the bounty system and provided for subsidised hunt clubs whose activities would be supervised by the Administration's Department of Nature Conservation.
- The Administration would also provide for the breeding and training of hunt hounds, training of hunters, to conduct research on methods to exterminate vermin, and provide technical advice to farmers on methods that were developed from the research.
- In 1958, the Administration bought the farm Vrolijkheid near Robertson to establish a hunt hound-breeding centre and conduct research on problem animals; as a result, the Division Problem Animal Control was established.
- In 1966, a second problem animal control station was established at Adelaide and in 1973, a third field station was established near Hartswater, thus extending the problem animal control services to the three regions of the Cape Province.

[52] Anonymous, 1977-1978. Probleemdierbeheer. Kaapse Departement van Natuurbewaring en Museumdienste. Verslag Nr. 34. pp. 57-65.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

In the report, Mr. Vorster provided a broad overview of the basic activities of the Division Problem Animal Control:

- Oversight: the Ordinance provided for a system of subsidised hunt clubs; the Provincial Administration subsidised the salaries of full-time professional hunters and the maintenance costs of hound packs. The Division Problem Animal Control supervised and ensured that the 81 subsidised hunt clubs functioned effectively and that payment of subsidies was justified.
- Research: previously the focus was mainly on control methods. A new intra-departmental committee would give guidance: the focus would be on determining the damage caused by animals, biology of problem animals, evaluation of existing control methods, development of new and improved methods of problem animal control and improved information and extension services to farmers.
- Training and extension services: courses in problem animal control would be provided to problem animal hunters employed by hunt clubs, individual farmers and departmental personnel during in-service training. On successfully passing a course, competence certificates would be issued to use coyote getters and hunting with hound packs. Lectures would be presented at farmer associations, schools, agricultural colleges and youth organisations. Pamphlets would also be prepared and distributed with information on problem animal control.
- Breeding and training of hounds: it had been an expensive, time consuming and the most specialised function of the Division Problem Animal Control; 69 of 81 registered hunt clubs were using hunt hounds either exclusively or in combination with other methods. Although some hunt clubs were breeding and training their own hounds, the stations at Vrolijkheid and Adelaide played an important role to provide newly established hunt clubs with trained hounds as well as young hounds for other hunt clubs.
- Provision of material and equipment: coyote getters would be imported from the USA and sold to certified users in the Cape Province. These coyote getters, as well as the locally produced cyanide cartridges (shells), would be sold from Vrolijkheid and the head office of the Eastern Cape Region. On average, 1 453 complete coyote getters were sold in seven years. During 1977, a total of 1 326 flasks (0.5 kg) of scent bait were sold.

As stated previously, a committee was appointed in 1976 to investigate the situation regarding the extermination of vermin and problem animal control in the Cape Province and their report with recommendations was submitted to the Administrator.

In total 22 of 26 registered hunt clubs was inspected in the Western Cape Region. The hunt records of these clubs showed that 1 067 head of small livestock was killed by black-backed jackals, caracals and vagrant dogs.

The following 1 533 animals were caught or killed during 1 468 hunts by Departmental problem animal control measures: 391 caracals (2 – coyote getters/79 – cage traps/158 - foothold traps/152 – hounds), 188 black-backed jackals (128 - coyote getters/52 – hounds/8 - foothold traps), 92 baboons (82 – cage traps/7 – foothold traps/3 - shot), 520 rock hyraxes (43 – hounds/23 – cage traps/434 – foothold traps/20 - shot), 44 Cape foxes (40 - coyote getters/3 - hounds/1 - cage trap), 62 vagrant dogs (49 – coyote getters/2 – foothold traps/10 – cage traps/1 - poison), 38 bat-eared foxes (1 – hounds/37 – coyote getters), 64 mongooses (9 - hounds/46 – coyote getters/6 – cage traps/3 – foothold traps), 5 genets (1 - hounds/3 – cage traps/1 – foothold trap), 26 African wildcats (10 - hounds/3 – cage traps/13 – foothold traps), 8 leopards (3 - hounds/1 – cage trap/4 – foothold traps), 51 African porcupines (4 - hounds/36 – cage traps/11 – foothold traps), 8 honey badgers (4 - hounds/1 – cage trap/3 – foothold traps), 28 meerkat (1 - hounds/27 coyote getters), 1 aardwolf (foothold trap) and 7 hares (foothold traps).

Version 5.0 - Hope Nel - Version 5.0

On average, the hunters conducted 13 hunts per month in the Cape Province.

The sales of problem animal control equipment included 11 725 cyanide cartridges (shells), 4 276 coyote getter firing units, 2 125 cartridge holders, 2 375 staples, 78 setting pliers, 39 pairs of gloves and 1 245 flasks (0.5 kg) of scent bait.

In the course of 74 training hunts with hounds from Vrolijkheid, 22 black-backed jackals, 4 caracals and 1 African wildcat were killed.

In the course of 70 problem animal control operations, the following 101 animals were caught or killed by personnel at Vrolijkheid: 2 black-backed jackals (coyote getters), 6 caracals (cage traps), 12 vagrant dogs (8 – coyote getters/4 – cage traps), 15 Cape foxes (coyote getters), 20 bat-eared foxes (coyote getters), 6 Cape grey mongoose (coyote getters), 1 small spotted genet (cage trap), 1 otter (cage trap), 1 marsh mongoose (cage trap), 1 crow (coyote getter), 1 meerkat (coyote getter), 31 baboon (cage traps), 1 leopard (foothold trap), 2 African porcupines (cage traps) and 1 African wildcat (cage trap).

There were 56 registered hunt clubs in the Eastern Cape Region and 44 were using hounds to hunt. In total, 48 hunt clubs were inspected and appeared to function satisfactorily. Most hunt clubs did not submit monthly reports, but it was hoped that the situation would improve when new forms to report were distributed early during 1978.

No registered hunt clubs received subsidies yet in the Northern Cape Region. Three courses in problem animal control were presented at Hartswater and 38 people attended. Bait was sold from Vrolijkheid to farmers that were using coyote getters. Hunting with hounds was tested in the Barkly West Divisional Council.

In the course of 189 training hunts with hounds from Adelaide, 24 black-backed jackals, 14 caracals and 14 bush pigs were killed.

Personnel set 905 coyote getters in the Barkly West and Vaalharts Divisional Councils: 575 were activated (pulled) and 205 carcases were found (129 problem animals, 71 other animals and 5 vagrant dogs).

The relatively few carcasses recorded were ascribed to the dense grass and other vegetation in these areas making detection of carcasses difficult. Personnel at Hartswater promoted the use of cage traps for caracal, but results of caracal caught were not available.

1978/79 – Cape Province

Mr. F. Vorster continued being responsible for problem animal control in the Cape Department of Nature Conservation and Museum Services[53]. He referred to the assistance provided by Mr. Malcolm Allison, a specialist of the United States Bureau of Sports, Fisheries and Wildlife. He came to the Cape Province in 1961 to adapt American techniques in predator control to South Africa and train personnel of the Department of Nature Conservation to conduct and carry on the work in future. Dr. Douglas Hey arranged this cooperation. After the visit of Mr. Allison, the equipment was refined to make it more selective and it was generally used; it was described as "*the most effective, most selective and humane method to control black-backed jackals and vagrant dogs, the most important problem animals for sheep farmers*."

[53] Anonymous, 1978/1979. Probleemdierbeheer. Kaapse Departement van Natuurbewaring en Museumdienste. Verslag Nr. 35. pp. 51-60.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

The report also alluded to the general practice to capture endangered problem animals and translocate them elsewhere and the challenges encountered specifically with members of the cat family that tend to return to their original territories when released.

In accordance with the provisions of the Ordinance on the Extermination of Vermin, 1957 (Ordinance No. 26 of 1957) the report followed the basic format of the previous year and again alluded to the functions of the Division Problem Animal Control:

- Supervision of hunt clubs: in total 81 hunt clubs were founded and subsidised by the Administration for the salaries of full time or part time professional hunters and to maintain packs of hunt hounds; it was the responsibility of the Division to ensure that the hunt clubs functioned satisfactorily and justify the payment of subsidies.
- Research: in the past research on problem animal control focussed mainly on the development of control methods. These studies were not conducted in an organised manner. Some *ad hoc* studies have been conducted and the results were published in thesis or old annual reports. An intra-departmental committee was established to manage and control all problem animal research in an organised and coordinated manner. Reference was made to a range of current research projects and where to find the information.
- Training and extension services: a short overview was given regarding the training courses presented by the Department and the distribution of relevant information in pamphlets and during lectures to the public, farmer's associations, schools and agricultural colleges.
- Breeding and training of hunt hounds: it remained an expensive, time consuming and the most specialised function of the Division Problem Animal Control; 69 of the 81 registered hunt clubs were using hunt hounds either exclusively or in combination with other methods. Although some hunt clubs were breeding and training their own hounds, the stations at Vrolijkheid and Adelaide played an important role to provide newly established hunt clubs with trained hounds as well as young hounds for other hunt clubs. The hounds were sold at prices that did not even fully recover their feeding costs; thus, it constituted a form of subsidy enjoyed by registered hunt clubs.
- Provision of materials and equipment: coyote getters have been imported from the USA and sold from Vrolijkheid and the Eastern Cape Regional Office to certified users in the Province to control black-backed jackals on a large scale. Recommendations by the committee of inquiry into problem animal control were submitted to the Administration and when implemented it may result in a total reorganisation of the system of problem animal control in the Cape Province; therefore, Divisional Councils and the Division Problem Animal Control were awaiting the outcome before making any new changes. It was foreseen that the prohibition by the Department of Health on the sale of strychnine by magistrates would have far-reaching consequences, especially in the Northern Cape Region where it was used to control black-backed jackals.

In accordance with the Cape Ordinance on Nature Conservation, leopards were protected but according to the IUCN, it was classified as rare and endangered. In total, 58 permits were issued for the control of damage-causing leopard of which 40 (59%) were requested from the Divisional Council areas of Ceres, Clanwilliam and Worcester. The possibility to proclaim a safe haven for leopard in the southern part of the Cape Province was investigated. Although it was widely appreciated by farmers and local governments, it was considered not yet opportune to implement such a venture.

In total, 20 registered hunt clubs in the Western Cape Region received subsidies. The following 1 617 animals were caught or killed with Departmental problem animal control measures during 1 991 control operations by hunt clubs: 212 black-backed jackals (206 - coyote getters/2 – hounds/4 - foothold traps), 277 caracals (7 – coyote getters/93 – cage traps/120 - foothold traps/56 – hounds/1 - shot), 104 baboons (2 - hounds/3 - coyote getters/95 – cage traps/4 -

Version 5.0 - HC de Waal - Version 5.0

foothold traps), 442 rock hyraxes (298 - hounds/24 - cage traps/120 - foothold traps), 79 vagrant dogs (23 – coyote getters/4 – foothold traps/52 - poison), 86 Cape foxes (64 - coyote getters/7 - hounds/15 - foothold traps), 71 bat-eared foxes (70 - coyote getters/1 - foothold trap), honey badgers (3 - hounds/13 - coyote getters/4 - foothold traps), 133 Cape grey mongooses (9 - hounds/107 - coyote getters/1 - cage trap/16 - foothold traps), 12 yellow mongooses (1 - hounds/11 - coyote getters), 22 marsh mongooses (8 - hounds/1 - cage trap/13 - foothold traps), 12 genets (5 - hounds/3 - cage traps/4 - foothold traps), 67 African porcupines (30 - hounds/3 - coyote getters/23 - cage traps/11 - foothold traps), 46 African wildcats (21 - hounds/6 - cage traps/19 - foothold traps), 13 leopard (2 - hounds/1 - cage trap/10 - foothold traps), 17 crows (15 - coyote getters/2 - foothold traps), 3 aardwolves (2 - hounds/1 - foothold trap) and 1 hare (cage trap).

The annual report specifically stated that these numbers of predators (caught or killed) did not represent all control operations by hunt clubs during the report year.

During 128 trial control operations and training hunts conducted by personnel based at Vrolijkheid, the following 154 animals were killed or caught: 14 black-backed jackals (5 - coyote getters/9 – hounds), 7 caracal (7 – cage traps), 4 vagrant dogs (3 – coyote getters/1 – cage trap), 101 baboons (cage traps), 8 Cape foxes (8 - coyote getter), 2 bat-eared foxes (coyote getters), 1 honey badger (hounds), 5 Cape grey mongooses (coyote getters), 2 yellow mongooses (coyote getters), 1 genet (coyote getter), 4 marsh mongooses (cage traps), 1 African porcupine (cage trap), 2 African wildcats (cage traps) and 2 leopards (foothold traps).

The sales of problem animal control equipment included 13 275 cyanide cartridges (shells), 2 363 coyote getter firing units, 2 860 cartridge holders, 1 385 staples, 60 setting pliers, 50 pairs of gloves, 1 069 flasks (0.5 kg) of scent bait for cage traps and 417 flasks (0.5 kg) of coyote getter bait. Coloured staff handled the preparation and distribution of bait at Vrolijkheid.

In total, 23 of 56 subsidised hunt clubs were visited in the Eastern Cape Region. A meaningful summary of activities could not be presented because of poor reporting by hunt clubs. During visits, the clubs were advised on the importance of submitting their monthly hunt reports.

The following 186 animals were caught or killed in the Eastern Cape Region by Departmental problem animal control personnel: 25 black-backed jackals (6 - coyote getters/19 – hounds), 30 caracals (7 – cage traps/23 – hounds/1 - shot), 3 vagrant dogs (3 – coyote getters), 29 bush pigs (hounds), 64 Cape foxes (63 - coyote getters/1 - hounds), 9 bat-eared foxes (coyote getters), 1 honey badger (cage trap), 13 Cape grey mongooses (coyote getters), 1 yellow mongoose (coyote getter), 1 African porcupine (hounds), 3 African wildcats (2 – hounds/1 cage trap), 1 leopard (hounds) and 6 vervet monkeys (cage traps).

In total, 76 animals were killed during hunts with hounds.

In total, 248 coyote getters were set of which 117 were activated (pulled); 95 carcases were retrieved.

The sales of problem animal control equipment from Adelaide were 79 flasks (0.5 kg) odour bait for cage traps and 48 flasks (0.5 kg) coyote getter bait.

The first four subsidised hunt clubs were established in the Northern Cape Region but no hunt reports were yet received.

Version 5.0 - HD de Waal - Version 5.0

The 66 animals caught or killed with Departmental problem animal control personnel included 47 black-backed jackals (40 - coyote getters/7 – hounds), 1 vagrant dog (1 – coyote getter), 16 baboons (cage traps during 2 control operations), 1 yellow mongoose and 1 brown hyaena (coyote getter).

The sales of problem animal control equipment from Hartswater were 48 flasks (0.5 kg) of scent bait for cage traps and coyote getters.

In total, 118 coyote getters were set of which 59 were activated (pulled); 43 carcases were retrieved.

From January 1979, a full-time problem animal control official was stationed at Die Vleie Nature Conservation Station near George. There were eight subsidised hunt clubs in four of 10 Divisional Councils in the area. The following 59 animals were killed or caught by the clubs with Departmental problem animal control measures: 22 black-backed jackals (10 – coyote getters/4 – foothold traps/8 – hounds), 13 caracals (2 – cage traps/3 - foothold traps/8 – hounds), 14 vagrant dogs (coyote getters), 1 Cape fox (hounds), 1 bat-eared fox (foothold trap), 1 honey badger (foothold trap), 4 Cape grey mongooses (coyote getters), 2 African porcupines (cage traps) and 1 African wildcat (cage trap).

Personnel based at Die Vleie Nature Conservation reserve conducted eight control operations and 13 animals were killed: 11 baboons (cage traps), 1 Cape grey mongoose (coyote getter) and 1 vagrant dog (coyote getter).

1978/79 – Orange Free State Province

On 1 March 1979 the Executive Committee approved an additional allocation of R50 000 for the 1978/79 financial year to Oranjejag[54].

The Administrator of the PAO was again advised about the recurring and increasing financial predicament of Oranjejag[55]. After considering the plight of Oranjejag, the Executive Committee resolved[56] to:

(a) Limit the subsidy of Oranjejag to 70% of its annual budget; the expenditure of the 1979/80 financial year would serve as baseline with an annual increment of 10%.

(b) Pay an additional amount of R79 000 to Oranjejag for the 1979/80 financial year, provided the money can be sourced within the Provincial budget.

(c) Provide R179 000 as subsidy to Oranjejag in the 1980/81 financial year.

(d) Provide R79 000 in the budget of the 1980/81 financial year if it cannot be sourced in the 1979/80 financial year.

(e) Inform Oranjejag that the Administration will not consider any increase in the subsidy for 1980/81 and subsequent years beyond as defined in (a) above and that the association must provide any additional funding if it was required.

(f) Subsidise capital services for housing of employees and animals to a maximum of 50% of the cost of the service in those cases where prior authorisation of the provision of the service was arranged and the erection cost did not exceed R2 000.

1979/80 – Orange Free State Province

The increases in annual expenses incurred by Oranjejag for hunters and hunts[57] were:

1980/81	1979/80	1978/79	1977/78	1977/76

[54] Executive Committee Resolution No. 85/1979.03.13 re Memo. B.12/1/2/1 of 1 March 1979.
[55] Memo B 12/1/4/1 of 1979.12.12 – Nature Conservation to Administrator Orange Free State Province.
[56] Executive Committee Resolution No. 2/1980.01.15 – Provincial Administration Orange Free State.
[57] Oranjejag Bloemfontein Financial Statements – 31 March 1980.

Version 5.0 - HG de Waal - Version 5.0

227 293	188 620	175 180	154 079	151 721

1979/80 – Cape Province

In the annual report[58] Mr. F. Vorster, Chief Professional Officer: Problem Animal Control in the Cape Department of Nature Conservation and Museum Services, referred to a "*momentous event in the history of problem animal control in the Cape Province.*" The Executive Committee of the CPA has with a few changes, accepted the recommendations of the Committee that investigated the vermin and problem animal control.

The recommendations included:

- Responsibility for the physical control of problem animals were designated to Divisional Councils;
- Registration of hunt clubs were withdrawn if they were not Divisional Council's clubs;
- Divisional Councils were compelled to appoint a control officer for problem animal control, collection of dog taxes and the provision of nature conservation services;
- Where circumstances allowed it, two or more Divisional Councils could jointly appoint such a control officer;
- A maximum subsidy of 50% would be paid towards the expenses of Divisional Councils after deduction of income derived specifically for problem animal control;
- the Cape Province was divided in 13 regions, each with a Departmental official responsible for supervision, extension, training and research;
- the appointment of advisory committees in each region with organised farmer representation; and
- caracals, black-backed jackals and vagrant dogs were classified as problem animals in the Cape Province.

The Department started with arrangements to implement the approved new system.

An important aspect of the Division Problem Animal Control's activities was supervision of the activities of registered and subsidised hunt clubs. In total 79 registered hunt clubs were active in the Cape Province, compared to 81 hunt clubs the previous year. Regarding the physical control of problem animals, hunt clubs appeared to have functioned satisfactorily. However, regarding feedback of hunt data, information of damage caused by animals and collecting biological material for research, there was much room for improvement. The 19 hunt clubs in the Western Cape Region were exceptions and provided useful information.

Seven problem animal control courses were attended by 65 persons (hunters, farmers and departmental staff). Problem animal matters were discussed at 17 meetings of farmers' associations. In total, 17 Divisional Councils were visited to discuss problem animal matters and challenges regarding the implementation of recommendations of the Coetzer Report.

The 1979/80 Annual Report stated that Vrolijkheid and Adelaide had the necessary facilities, personnel and knowledge to breed quality hounds, maintain, and train the hounds. Sheep dogs were trained at Adelaide for the more specialised hunting needed for bush pigs. Many jackal hounds were killed because of the fearless way in which they have attacked bush pigs.

Good cooperation was received from the 26 registered hunt clubs in the Western Cape Region and a summary was provided of 1 944 hunts conducted by these clubs. The following 1 745 animals were caught or killed with Departmental problem animal control measures: 163 black-

[58] Anonymous, 1979/1980. Probleemdierbeheer. Kaapse Departement van Natuurbewaring en Museumdienste. Verslag Nr. 36. pp. 49-56.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Versie 5.0

backed jackals (130 - coyote getters/28 – hounds/4 - foothold traps/1 – cage trap), 229 caracals (2 – coyote getters/46 – cage traps/40 – hounds/141 - foothold traps), 60 vagrant dogs (31 – coyote getters/11 – cage traps/10 – foothold traps), 222 baboons (2 - hounds/212 – cage traps/1 – foothold trap/7 - shot), 744 rock hyraxes (hounds), 37 Cape foxes (24 - coyote getters/1 - hounds/12 - foothold traps), 92 bat-eared foxes (2 - hounds/85 – coyote getters/5 - foothold traps), 2 honey badgers (1 - hounds/1 – coyote getter), 75 Cape grey mongooses (11 - hounds/53 – coyote getters/6 – cage traps/5 – foothold traps), 1 yellow mongoose (coyote getter), 10 marsh mongooses (4 - hounds/1 – coyote getter/5 – cage traps), 9 genets (3 - hounds/3 – cage traps/3 - foothold traps), 15 African porcupines (5 - hounds/4 – coyote getters/3 – cage traps/3 - foothold traps), 58 African wildcats (37 - hounds/5 – cage traps/16 - foothold traps), 10 leopards (2 – cage traps/8 - foothold traps), 11 crows (coyote getters), 4 aardwolves (1 - coyote getter/3 – foothold traps) and 3 otters (cage traps).

In total of 1 981 unspecified head of livestock were reportedly killed by black-backed jackals (614), caracals (940), vagrant dogs (174), Cape foxes (35), honey badgers (3), marsh mongooses (24), African wildcats (49) and leopards (142).

Good results were achieved with coyote getters in the Namaqualand Divisional Council: 1 115 getters were set of which 325 have been activated (pulled), resulting in the recovery of 257 carcasses (79%) of which 121 (47%) were black-backed jackals; therefore, "*in Namaqualand, about 10 coyote getters must be set to kill a single black-backed jackal*."

Two problem animal control courses were presented at Vrolijkheid and during the control trials, Departmental personnel caught or killed 112 animals: 29 black-backed jackals (2 - coyote getters/26 – hounds/1 - foothold trap), 7 caracals (6 – cage traps/1 – hounds), 8 vagrant dogs (1 – coyote getter/4 – cage traps/3 – shot), 43 baboons (cage traps), 8 bat-eared foxes (2 - hounds/5 – coyote getters), 5 Cape foxes (5 - coyote getters), 5 Cape grey mongooses (coyote getters), 1 Verreaux's eagle (coyote getter), 2 yellow mongooses (coyote getters), 1 leopard (foothold trap) and 3 African wildcats (cage traps).

The sales of problem animal control equipment included 8 901 cyanide cartridges (shells), 1 382 coyote getter firing units, 1 560 cartridge holders, 1 319 staples, 64 setting pliers, 26 pairs of gloves, 995 flasks (0.5 kg) of scent bait for cage traps and 295 flasks (0.5 kg) of coyote getter bait.

Requests for permits to hunt leopard were handled at Vrolijkheid. In addition to the numbers provided in the table[59], Departmental personnel have also killed six leopards. The 29 leopards

[59] Information regarding control of damage-causing leopards.

Divisional Council	Permits issued	Leopards caught	Livestock losses	
			Small livestock	Cattle
Ceres	18	7	63	-
Clanwilliam	34	8	173	2
Gordonia	2	2	28	-
Heidelberg	1	-	14	-
Humansdorp	5	1	123	1
Kenhardt	2	-	38	-
Klein Karoo/Langkloof	4	-	8	-
Knysna	2	-	52	2
Ladismith	1	1	3	1
Montagu	2	1	17	-
Namaqualand	6	-	35	21
Paarl	1	-	?	-
Robertson	1	-	8	3
Somerset East	3	-	10	-

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

killed were caught with foothold traps (20), cage traps (5) and hounds (4). Foothold traps were not recommended to catch leopard, but the difficult mountainous terrain in some areas excluded the use of the other methods. For every four permits issued, one leopard had been caught or killed.

Insufficient information was received from the 56 registered hunt clubs in the Eastern Cape Region. However, the following animas were caught or killed with Departmental problem animal control measures during control trials in the Eastern Cape Region: 17 black-backed jackals (3 - coyote getters/14 – hounds), 32 caracals (15 – cage traps/17 – hounds), 20 vagrant dogs (20 – coyote getters), 5 Cape foxes (5 - coyote getters), 47 bush pigs (hounds), 12 bat-eared foxes (coyote getters), 2 honey badgers (hounds), 13 meerkat (coyote getters), 9 African porcupine (cage traps), 2 African wildcats (hounds), 78 vervet monkeys (cage traps), 1 hare (coyote getter), 124 baboons (cage traps), 34 rock hyraxes (hounds), 2 crows (coyote getters), 1 otter (cage trap), 1 aardvark (cage trap) and 3 leopards (cage traps).

In a single trial, 124 baboons were caught, demonstrating the efficacy of cage traps to catch baboons.

In total 1 611 head of livestock losses were attributed to black-backed jackals (142), caracals (322), vagrant dogs (42), bush pigs (9), African wildcats (2), baboons (14), otters (24) and leopards (1 056). The large number of livestock included 900 fowls killed by three leopards.

No reports were received from the subsidised hunt clubs in the Northern Cape Region. The following 110 animals were caught or killed by staff with Departmental problem animal control measures during control trials: 46 black-backed jackals (coyote getters), 2 Cape foxes (coyote getters), 48 baboons (cage traps), 1 genet (coyote getter), 5 meerkat (coyote getters), 7 vervet monkeys (cage traps) and 1 common peacock (coyote getter).

In total 62 livestock were killed by black-backed jackals. Reportedly, in some cases in the Northern Cape heifers have been mauled by black-backed jackals while still alive; these heifers were lying down and having difficulty in giving birth to their calves.

The Problem Animal Control Official resigned at Die Vleie Nature Conservation Station. The eight subsidised hunt clubs in the Southern Cape Region only submitted hunt reports sporadically.

1980/81 – Cape Province

According to the 1980 /81 Annual Report,[60] "*The recommendations of the Committee of Inquiry in Problem Animal Control have been approved by the Executive Committee but have not yet been implemented owing to financial reasons and the rationalisation program of the public service. One of the highlights of the year was the inter-provincial problem animal conference held in Bloemfontein. Discussions covered the entire field of problem animal control and there were contributions from representatives of this Department.*"

Swellendam	1	-	32	-
Tulbagh	2	-	6	-
Uitenhage	2	-	-	7
Worcester	14	2	54	7
Totals	101	23	665	44

[60] Anonymous, 1980/81. Problem Animal Control. Cape Department of Nature Conservation and Museum Services. Report No. 37. pp. 44-49.

Version 5.0 - Hilo de Wet - Version 5.0

No specific information could be retrieved about this so-called "inter-provincial conference" which was convened during 1981.

The annual report also referred to interaction by a specialist from abroad: "*Mr. R. McBride, a professional problem animal hunter from the U.S.A., visited Vrolijkheid. Departmental officers could learn considerably from him. He also conducted an experiment with the so-called poison collar.*"

Only 13% of the 79 hunt clubs in the Cape Province submitted reports regularly and a further 10 hunt clubs only submitted reports sporadically, but this matter would receive further attention as soon as the future control systems were clearly defined.

It is important to note the following remark in the annual report: "*The out-of-date subsidy system makes it difficult for hunt clubs to give effective service. It was therefore encouraging to hear that the Administrator has approved the utilization by divisional councils of up to 80% of the surplus funds in the special dog-tax account for problem animal control.*"

A summary was provided for 14 subsidised hunt clubs in the Western Cape Region during 1 382 hunts. The following 788 animals were caught or killed with Departmental problem animal control measures: 157 black-backed jackals (136 - coyote getters/14 – hounds/2 - foothold traps/5 - shot), 192 caracals (10 – coyote getters/76 – cage traps/25 – hounds/81 - foothold traps), 12 vagrant dogs (2 – cage traps/1 – foothold trap), 107 baboons (106 – cage traps/1 - foothold trap), 158 rock hyraxes (hounds), 17 Cape foxes (10 - coyote getters/7 - foothold traps), 63 bat-eared foxes (6 – hounds/53 - coyote getters/4 cage - traps), 7 honey badgers (6 – hounds/53 – coyote getters/4 – cage traps), 30 Cape grey mongooses (coyote getters), 2 yellow mongooses (coyote getters), 7 African porcupines (1 – hounds/2 – coyote getters/1 – cage trap/3 – foothold traps), 1 genet (hounds), 20 Cape wildcats (11 – hounds/3 – coyote getters/6 – foothold traps), 11 leopards (2 – cage traps/9 - foothold traps), 1 crow (coyote getter) and 3 aardwolves (2 – cage traps/1 – foothold trap).

A total of 1 441 head of livestock losses were attributed to predation by black-backed jackals (624), caracals (594), vagrant dogs (110), Cape foxes (35), honey badgers (4), African wildcats (10) and leopards (64).

Vrolijkheid handled requests for permits to hunt leopard. For every 2.6 permits issued, 1 leopard had been caught or killed. In addition to the data in the table[61], three leopards have also been caught near Humansdorp.

[61] Information regarding control of damage-causing leopards.

Divisional Council	Permits issued	Leopards caught	Livestock losses	
			Small livestock	Cattle
Bredasdorp/Swellendam	1	-	-	-
Cederberg	16	8	116	7
Gordonia	2	2	48	-
Humansdorp	3	2	21	21
Klein Karoo/Langkloof	3	1	56	7
Koup	2	1	96	-
Langeberg	6	-	26	-
Matroosberg	5	2	29	2
Namaqualand	3	1	49	-
Wintershoek	4	-	43	-
Witzenberg	9	4	28	-
Wynland	8	3	68	-
Totals	62	24	580	37

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

Three basic types of training courses were presented: a course for departmental officers, a course for farmers and a course for full-time hunters from hunt clubs[62]. A supplementary course was also presented to farmers on the practical aspects of problem animal control.

The judicious use of foothold traps, colloquially also known as spring traps was emphasised.

Agricultural unions and groups of school children were addressed. Adelaide received 575 visitors of which 73 were foreigners.

The report listed the number of items sold, namely 857 coyote getters, 857 cartridge holders, 637 staples, 6 819 cyanide cartridges (shells), 38 setting pliers and 15 pairs of gloves. For a period of three months, cyanide cartridges (shells) could not be supplied because the stock was low; 2 000 complete coyote getters were imported from the USA. The Department also sold 319 bait flasks (500 g) for coyote getters and 1 034 for cage traps.

Very few hounds were sold from Vrolijkheid and, as hounds were not in great demand, no hounds were bred. Most hounds were sold at Adelaide, including those transferred from Vrolijkheid.

Officials regularly undertook hunts to conduct research, extension and training:

- In the Western Cape Region (from Vrolijkheid) 87 animals were killed or caught, namely 21 black-backed jackals (10 – coyote getters/7 - hounds/4 – foothold traps), 5 caracals (hounds), 6 vagrant dogs (2 – coyote getters/3 – cage traps/1 – foothold trap), 17 baboons (cage traps), 8 bat-eared foxes (3 – coyote getters/3 – hounds/2 – foothold traps), 4 Cape foxes (coyote getters), 11 Cape grey mongooses (coyote getters), 1 yellow mongoose (coyote getter), 2 genets (cage traps), 1 African porcupine (coyote getter), 5 rock hyraxes (cage traps), 1 crow (coyote getter), 2 Cape grysbok (cage traps), 1 pheasant (cage trap) and 1 goat (coyote getter). A total of 17 baboons and 2 Cape grysbok have been kept alive and donated to universities or other institutions.
- In the Eastern Cape Region (from Adelaide) 437 animals were killed or caught, namely 15 black-backed jackals (hounds), 113 caracals (46 – cage traps/67 - hounds), 111 bush pigs (hounds), 6 baboons (hounds), 45 rock hyraxes (coyote getters), 50 vagrant dogs (35 – coyote getters/15 – cage traps), 9 mongooses (5 – coyote getters/4 - hounds), 42 vervet monkeys (cage traps), 35 African porcupines (cage traps), 2 leopards (hounds), 1 honey badger (hounds), 4 African wildcats (hounds), 2 aardwolves (cage traps) and 1 aardvark (cage trap).

1980/81 – Orange Free State Province

The increases in annual expenses incurred by Oranjejag for hunters and hunts[63] were:

1980/81	1979/80	1978/79	1977/78	1976/77
254 333	227 293	188 620	175 180	154 079

[62] A summary of training regarding problem animal control:

Number of courses and attendees	Region			Total
	Eastern Cape	Western Cape	Northern Cape	
Courses	10	4	2	16
Farmers	14	69	35	118
Officers	8	9	5	22
Full-time officers	7	-	1	8
Total	29	78	41	148

[63] Oranjejag Bloemfontein Financial Statements – 31 March 1981.

Version 5.0 HOUSEWARD Version 5.0

The Administration have decided to change the process of payment by paying the total subsidy and other money owed to Oranjejag in a single transaction at the beginning of the financial year; on 1 April 1980 the Administration[64] delivered a cheque for R276 000 (comprising two amounts: R79 000 and R197 000) by hand to Mrs. Esther Brand, Director of Oranjejag.

1981/82 – Cape Province

The continuous monitoring of hunt club activities and the reporting represent one of the most important activities of the Division[65]. In total 97 hunt clubs were active in 23 Divisional Councils.

The monthly reports of only 14 hunt clubs, all located in the Western Cape Region, were received regularly. The following 1 001 animals were caught or killed by the hunt clubs with Departmental problem animal control measures: 337 black-backed jackals (284 - coyote getters/40 – hounds/13 - foothold traps), 254 caracals (3 – coyote getters/61 – cage traps/62 – hounds/127 - foothold traps), 2 vagrant dogs (1 - coyote getter/1 – shot), 200 baboons (1 – hounds/189 – cage traps/8 – foothold traps/2 - shot), 75 rock hyraxes (74 - hounds/1 – foothold trap), 16 Cape foxes (9 - coyote getters/5 – hounds/2 - foothold traps), 29 bat-eared foxes (26 – coyote traps/1 – hounds/1 – cage trap/1 – foothold trap), 6 honey badgers (1 – cage trap/5 – foothold traps), 21 Cape grey mongooses (15 – coyote getters/2 – hounds/4 – foothold traps), 3 yellow mongooses (2 – coyote getters/1 – cage trap), 8 African porcupines (1 – cage trap/7 – foothold traps), 31 African wildcats (21 – hounds/1 – cage trap/9 – foothold traps), 14 leopards (3 – cage traps/11 – foothold traps), 3 crows (coyote getters) and 2 aardwolves (foothold traps).

Losses of 2 242 head of small livestock were attributed to black-backed jackals (928), caracals (1 117), vagrant dogs (14), baboons (17), Cape foxes (10), honey badgers (4), African wildcats (14) and leopards (138).

Leopards have also killed 17 large livestock.

Vrolijkheid[66] handled requests for permits to hunt leopard. For every three permits issued, one leopard had been caught or killed.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

[64] File N12/7/4 – letters and payment forms, dated 1 April 1980.

[65] Anonymous, 1981/82. Probleemdierbeheer. Kaapse Departement van Natuurbewaring en Museumdienste. Verslag Nr. 38. pp. 40-53.

[66] Information regarding control of damage-causing leopards.

Divisional Council	Permits issued	Leopards caught	Livestock losses	
			Small livestock	Cattle
Cederberg	10	2	41	-
Humansdorp	2	1	3	-
Kenhardt	1	1	2	-
Klein Karoo/Langkloof	5	1	35	-
Koup	1	-	6	-
Langeberg	3	1	13	?
Matroosberg	6	-	10	5
Namaqualand	3	1	27	15
Outeniqua	3	2	10	3
Wintershoek	2	-	16	2
Witzenberg	23	9	107	2
Wynland	6	1	32	1
Totals	65	19	302	28

The various training courses were well attended[67].

The Department conducted training courses to refine hunting methods and a range of animals were caught or killed during these activities, namely:

- 72 animals in the Western Cape Region: 46 black-backed jackals (43 – hounds/3 - foothold traps), 6 caracals (3 – cage traps/3 – hounds), 3 vagrant dogs (1 - coyote getter/1 – cage trap/1 – foothold trap), 2 bat-eared foxes (coyote getters), 4 Cape foxes (3 - coyote getters/1 - foothold trap), 3 Cape grey mongooses (2 – coyote getters/1 – cage trap), 1 yellow mongoose (coyote getter), 1 African porcupine (cage trap), 3 rock hyraxes (2 – cage traps/1 – foothold trap), 1 crow (coyote getter), 1 leopard (hounds) and 1 African wildcat (cage trap).
- 259 animals in the Eastern Cape Region: 11 black-backed jackals (11 – hounds), 59 caracals (6 – cage traps/53 – hounds), 24 vagrant dogs (12 - coyote getters/4 – cage traps/8 – shot), 10 baboons (4 – cage traps/6 - hounds), 16 Cape grey mongooses (4 – cage traps/12 - hounds), 1 yellow mongoose (hounds), 19 African porcupines (18 - cage traps/1 - hounds), 2 aardwolves (cage traps), 4 honey badgers (hounds), 2 vervet monkeys (cage traps), 102 bush pigs (hounds), 6 African wildcats (hounds) and 3 leopards (hounds).

The report also listed the number of items sold: 1 734 coyote getters, 1 929 cyanide cartridges (shells), 1 379 staples, 8 615 cyanide cartridges (shells), 80 setter pliers, 55 pairs of gloves, 373 bait flasks (500 g) for coyote getters and 648 for cage traps.

The sales of hunt hounds have reached a low point. Because of the high cost to breed, train and maintain such hunt hound packs, the continuation of this service was reviewed. In the meantime, it was considered to decrease the number of hounds.

Ad hoc research projects, including the poison collar (LPC) have been conducted.

In accordance with the provisions of the Vermin Extermination Ordinance, 1957 (Ordinance 26 of 1957), the Division Problem Animal Control was responsible for the approval and subsidising of hunters and hunt hound packs of registered hunt clubs, the payment of subsidies regarding the bounty system in those Divisional Councils without hunt clubs and to provide advice to Divisional Councils regarding the procedure to register hunt clubs. In total, 83 registered hunt clubs were active in 22 Divisional Council areas and R39 661 was paid as subsidies for hunters, hound packs and bounties.

1981/82 – Orange Free State Province

On 24 April 1981, Mrs. Esther Brand, Director of Oranjejag, acknowledged receipt[68] of a cheque of R216 700 from the Administration.

In a letter dated 11 August 1982, the Director of Nature Conservation confirmed the membership of Oranjejag as being 3 840 and that subscriptions to the value of R104 697 were received.

Version 5.0 - Hoole Weal - Version 5.0

[67] A summary of training regarding problem animal control:

Number of courses and attendees	Region			Total
	Eastern Cape	Western Cape	Northern Cape	
Courses	4	9	2	15
Farmers	6	38	11	55
Officers	2	5	2	9
Full-time officers	3	2	-	5
Total	11	45	13	69

[68] File N12/7/4 – handwritten note on the letter dated 1 April 1981.

1982/83 – Cape Province

The annual report noted that the primary responsibility for problem animal control rested with the landowner, while the role of the Department was to support and provide advice in the Cape Province[69]. The Department provided financial support to hunters of Divisional Councils and 73 registered hunt clubs by paying subsidies to the amount of R50 441.

The Department sold 5 760 cyanide cartridges (shells), 874 coyote getter firing units, 874 coyote getters, 36 hounds and 1 108 bait flasks (500 g).

The following 316 animals were caught or killed with Departmental problem animal control measures: 121 black-backed jackals (94 - coyote getters/27 - hounds), 59 caracals (8 – cage traps/51 - hounds), 8 vagrant dogs (6 - coyote getters/2 – cage traps), 9 Cape foxes (8 - coyote getters/1 - hounds), 10 Cape grey mongooses (1 – coyote getter/2 - cage traps/7 - hounds), 18 yellow mongooses (15 – coyote getters/1 – cage trap/2 - hounds), 3 large-spotted genets (coyote getters), 6 brown hyaenas (coyote getters), 18 African porcupines (13 – cage traps/5 - hounds), 2 leopards (hounds), 5 African wildcats (2 – cage traps/3 - hounds), 3 honey badgers (hounds), 6 otters (cage traps), 8 baboons (5 – hounds/3 - shot), 38 bush pigs (hounds) and 2 vervet monkeys (1 – cage trap/1 - hounds).

The province managed damage caused by leopards. In addition to 2 leopards that were caught by the Department, the following information was available[70]. Permits were only issued when damage to livestock had been proven and landowners may obtain a permit to keep the skin but was not allowed to dispose of it.

1982/83 – Orange Free State Province

On 8 April 1982, the Administration authorised payment of R238 400 (rounded from a calculated R238 370) as subsidy to Oranjejag.

In a letter dated 27 July 1983, the Director of Nature Conservation confirmed the membership of Oranjejag as being 3 240 and that subscriptions to the value R146 492 were received.

The increases in annual expenses incurred by Oranjejag for hunters and hunts[71] were:

[69] Anonymous, 1982/83. Probleemdierbeheer. Kaapse Departement van Natuur- en Omgewingsbewaring. Verslag Nr. 39. pp. 25-26.

[70] Information regarding control of damage-causing leopards.

Divisional Council	Permits issued	Leopards caught	Livestock losses	
			Small livestock	Cattle
Bredasdorp/Swellendam	2	-	6	-
Cederberg	15	4	114	7
Humansdorp	2	-	63	-
Kenhardt	5	4	8	1
Klein Karoo/Langkloof	3	1	16	8
Koup	3	2	37	-
Langeberg	7	4	39	6
Matroosberg	18	3	114	3
Midland	1	1	30	-
Namaqualand	2	-	18	1
Swartland	2	1	33	-
Witzenberg	21	6	37	2
Wynland	5	-	54	-
Totals	86	26	569	28

[71] Oranjejag Bloemfontein Financial Statements – 31 March 1983.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

1982/83	1981/82	1980/81	1979/80	1978/79
330 392	272 806	254 333	227 293	188 620

1982/83 – Transvaal Province

The TPA allocated an amount of R25 000 as subsidy to the Federal Problem Animal Control Association ("of Transvaal")[72].

1983/84 – Cape Province

The following 418 animals were caught or killed with Departmental problem animal control measures[73]: 69 black-backed jackals (44 - coyote getters/25 - hounds), 12 Cape foxes (coyote getters), 4 bat-eared foxes (coyote getters), 12 vagrant dogs (10 - coyote getters/2 – cage traps), 2 honey badgers (hounds), 16 Cape grey mongooses (12 – coyote getters/4 – cage traps), 13 other viverridae spp. (12 – coyote getters/1 – cage trap), 2 aardwolves (1 – coyote getter/1 - hounds), 3 brown hyaenas (2 – coyote getters/1 – cage trap), 4 African wildcats (1 - coyote getter/2 – cage traps/1 - hounds), 57 caracals (14 – cage traps/43 - hounds), 26 bush pigs (hounds), 16 African porcupines (1 – coyote getter/14 – cage traps/1 - hounds) and 182 baboons (178 – cage traps/4 - hounds).

Damage caused by leopards was also managed in the Province[74].
The Cape Province published a comprehensive Development Programme for Problem Animal Research[75], authored by two senior scientists, Mr. J.E. Lensing (Problem Animal Research Office) and Mr. F. Vorster (Responsible Officer, Problem Animal Control). The goal was to develop a prioritised research programme in line with the mandate of the Department; therefore, activities regarding predation control in the Cape Province have been reviewed in depth. A "*total of 39 problem animal hunters, Secretaries of Divisional Councils, hunt club officials and individual farmers were consulted*."

The review was conducted in the context of the existing Vermin Extermination Ordinance, 1957 (Ordinance 26 of 1957) also referred to as the "Problem Animal Ordinance" and was very frank about several aspects, namely:

[72] Anonymous, 1982/83. The Province of Transvaal Official Gazette Extraordinary 24 August 1983, Vol. 226, No. 4281, First Schedule, No. 5.
[73] Anonymous, 1983/84. Probleemdierbeheer. Kaapse Departement van Natuur- en Omgewingsbewaring. Verslag Nr. 40. pp. 63.
[74] Information regarding control of damage-causing leopards.

Divisional Council	Permits issued	Leopards caught	Livestock losses	
			Small livestock	Cattle
Caledon	1	-	1	
Cederberg	10	2	112	1
Humansdorp	4	1	34	1
Kenhardt	1	1	8	-
Klein Karoo/Langkloof	2	-	-	2
Koup	3	-	26	-
Langeberg	2	1	14	-
Matroosberg	9	2	63	10
Namaqualand	3	-	-22	-
Outeniqua	1	-		4
Swartland	3	1	24	2
Winterhoek	1	1	30	-
Witzenberg	12	4	19	2
Wynland	3	-	14	2
Totals	55	13	367	24

[75] Lensing, J.E. & Vorster, F., 1983. Ontwikkelingsprogram vir Probleemdiernavorsing. Departement van Natuur- en Omgewingsbewaring, Kaapse Provinsiale Administrasie (13 October 1983).

Version 5.0 - HOLdeWaal - Version 5.0

- The study listed 10 Divisional Council hunt clubs; 88 hunt clubs officially registered with the Department; the whereabouts of 12 unregistered control organisations were known; and three areas where bounty systems still applied.
- An underlying conflict of interest was noted in the Department's policy regarding problem animal control, namely to "*exterminate vermin*" and then the "*conservation of nature*" as a whole, namely fauna, flora and their habitat.
- Conservation is an inseparable part of control and one must not affect the other; therefore, the Department should be able to eliminate undesirable practices such as the use of non-selective control methods, the injudicious use of chemical control methods and payment of bounties.
- A dichotomy was created by legislation, perceptions and poor communication regarding the effective and controlled use of specific chemicals such as strychnine, sodium cyanide and sodium monofluoroacetate (Compound 1080) in predation management.
- Article 14 of the Ordinance stated that "*subsidy is payable to a hunt club if it employs an approved hunter and according to the opinion of the Director of Nature and Environment Conservation is executing its obligations satisfactorily*"; therefore, by killing a reasonable number of problem animals the hunt club was usually considered as executing its obligations "satisfactorily."
- Read together with other directives in the Ordinance, it was clear the Department had no legal authority to determine whether there was indeed a need to form a hunt club; the expenditure of the Department on subsidies was therefore outside its legal control.
- Hunt reports were not submitted regularly, but since there was no legal obligation for hunt clubs or hunters to submit information, the Department simply had to rely on the goodwill of individuals.
- At best, the hunt reports could be used to determine the activity of hunters but was not of much help to supervise and ascertain whether satisfactory services were rendered.
- It was suggested to improve the reporting format to gain more meaningful information regarding predators, the selectivity of methods and therefore efficacy of hunting operations.
- Hunters were poorly remunerated and over time hunters with lower levels of literacy were employed; these hunters were increasingly recruited from the pool of farm labourers with similar low salaries.
- The Department only allowed white hunters to be trained in the use of the coyote getter, because the firing mechanism was considered a firearm.
- Hunt clubs used the small subsidies they received from the Department to pay a basic salary to their hunters and were not willing to top it up with own funds.
- The poor literacy levels of hunters hampered efforts for training in new techniques and advanced technologies; therefore, the quality of the hunters was questionable.
- The poor literacy levels of hunters meant that little improvement could be made in terms of insight regarding ecological values of control versus extermination of predators.
- Hunters often had no transport of their own and were transported by farmers to their next assignments; many hunters were working on foot to set traps on the farms.
- Hunters worked in isolation and had very little contact with each other; therefore, much needed interaction and exchange of experience and transfer of skills were limited.
- The facilities of hunt clubs for the keeping of the hounds were often not appropriate and the physical condition of some hounds were also poor, but in the absence of specific instructions to hunters and hunt clubs, little could be done in this regard.
- Over time the trainers of hounds, with their vast experience and skills, were engaged fulltime at Vrolijkheid and Adelaide and not used to inspect the facilities for keeping and handling of hounds by hunt clubs; the officials who have been inspecting the hunt clubs were often less experienced and competent than those they were supposed to inspect and supervise.

Version 5.0 – H.J. de Waal – Version 5.0

- During the period 1959/60 to 1982/83, a total of 1 005 hounds were sold by Vrolijkheid; 611 hounds were sold by Adelaide during the period 1966/67 to 1982/83.
- It was concluded that the two hound breeding stations had served their purpose and there was a decline in the number of hounds sold towards the end of the period; it was ascribed to changes in hunting methods following the introduction of the coyote getter in the 1960's, the introduction of the cage trap for caracal, and hunt clubs started to breed their own hounds.

The report listed the following aspects regarding coyote getters:

- The coyote getter was provided by a sole manufacturer (Humane Coyote Getter Inc., Colorado, USA), thus raising two concerns: firstly, it may be regarded as a firearm and hence subjected to the firearms sanctions imposed on South Africa, and secondly, it has been banned since 1972 by the USA Federal Government, therefore the continued existence of the sole manufacturers was uncertain.
- As an interim solution, arrangements have been made by the Department to manufacture the coyote getters locally and procured it annually in a single order for the four provinces in South Africa and Namibia; the response from role players for this initiative was poor and it was abandoned.
- The concerns expressed previously regarding coyote getters did not yet materialise at the time of releasing the report, but the Department remained alert to any detrimental changes in the continued availability of coyote getters in South Africa.
- Challenges regarding the quality of the cyanide cartridges (shells) produced locally by P.M.P. for use in the coyote getters, were highlighted: (i) insufficient shielding of gun powder from absorbing moisture rendering it harmless and conditioning the animal to avoid a coyote getter in future; (ii) course, industrial grade sodium cyanide was used and the small ratio of volume to surface area affected its reaction time in the mouth of the animal causing it to travel much further before dying or being able to eject the pellets quickly from its mouth thus avoiding death; (iii) the inappropriate loose packaging of the shells in containers without sufficient air tight protection to prevent absorbing moisture; and (iv) inadequate information (lot number, dangerous substance, shelf life, instructions to destroy it, etc.) was provided on the packaging resulting in the use of aged shells.
- These challenges were discussed in June 1982 at a meeting attended by representatives of the Department, P.M.P., the distributors Musgrave Manufacturers and other distributors. The manufacturer P.M.P. undertook to test the shells but to date nothing had been forthcoming.
- Challenges regarding the selling, possession, handling and use of sodium cyanide under the provisions of the Act on Dangerous Substances (Act 15 of 1973) were highlighted, with specific reference to the non-compliance in several instances by the Department of Nature Conservation that was acting without having a valid licence.

1983/84 – Orange Free State Province

On 7 April 1983, Oranjejag requested the Administration for its annual subsidy of R262 240. A note refers to a cheque of R262 200 for Oranjejag, dated 2 May 1983[76].

In a letter dated 11 April 1984, the Director of Oranjejag confirmed to the Director of Nature Conservation that its membership was 3 150 and that subscriptions to the value of R136 609 were received.

The increases in annual expenses incurred by Oranjejag for hunters and hunts[77] were:

1983/84	1982/83	1981/82	1980/81	1979/80

[76] File N12/7/4 – handwritten note re cheque no. 01201862, dated 2/5/83.
[77] Oranjejag Bloemfontein Financial Statements – 31 March 1984.

Version 5.0 – HO Upward – Version 5.0

348 666	330 392	272 806	254 333	227 293

The Director of Nature Conservation reflected on the financial statements of Oranjejag with specific reference to: the strict financial control by the management of Oranjejag over its expenses with small annual increase of only 3.18%; the steady decline in membership from 4 213 (1979/80) to 3 025 (1983/84); the fact that no coyote getters were available to purchase during the year; and the number of damage-causing animals killed[78].

A list was provided of the damage-causing animals that have been killed over a 5-year period (1979/80 to 1983/84) by hunters of Oranjejag[79].

1983/84 – Transvaal Province

The TPA allocated an amount of R25 000 as subsidy to the Federal Problem Animal Control Association ("of Transvaal")[80].

1984/85 – Cape Province

The Vermin Extermination Ordinance, 1957 (Ordinance 26 of 1957) was amended by the Problem Animal Control Amendment Ordinance, 1984 (Ordinance 19 of 1984)[81] [Official Gazette of 24 August 1984]. As indicated in the title of the Amendment Ordinance, the Ordinance's name was changed to the short title of Problem Animal Control Ordinance, 1957. The term "problem animal" substituted the term "vermin" and vagrant dogs were added to the Schedule.

Important changes have also been made in the Ordinance to the formulae for subsidies "*which makes provision for payment of 50% of expenses incurred in respect of the salaries of hunters and the maintenance of hounds.*" There were *"84 registered hunt clubs in 21 Divisional Council areas and R32 416 was paid out in respect of the subsidizing of hunters, packs of hounds and bounties.*"

The following predators were caught or killed with Departmental problem animal control measures: 65 black-backed jackals (52 - coyote getters/2 – foothold traps/11 - hounds), 4 Cape foxes (1 - coyote getter/1 – cage trap/2 - hounds) and 10 vagrant dogs (1 - coyote getter/3 – cage traps/6 - shot).

1984/85 – Orange Free State Province

On 4 April 1984, the Directorate of Nature Conservation paid a single amount of R288 400 to Oranjejag as subsidy for the 1983/84 financial year.

Version 5.0 - HD de Waal - Version 5.0

[78] File N12/7/4 – Memo B 12/1/4/1, dated 27/8/84.

[79] Damage-causing animals killed over a 5-year period.

Animals	1979/80	1980/81	1981/82	1982/83	1983/84
Brown hyaena	8	3	3	1	-
Caracal	166	189	127	132	129
Black-backed jackal	703	744	699	829	919
Cape fox	2 247	2 020	1 729	2 402	2 590
African wildcat	132	91	97	99	76
Vagrant dogs	150	179	107	157	207

[80] Anonymous, 1983.84. The Province of Transvaal Official Gazette 8 August 1984, Vol. 229, No. 4338, First Schedule, No. 5.

[81] Anonymous, 1984/85. Wild animals and problem animal control. Cape Department of Nature and Environmental Conservation. Report No. 41. pp. 35-37.

In a letter, dated 1 May 1985, the Director of Oranjejag confirmed to the Director of Nature Conservation that membership was 2 730 and that subscriptions to the value of R135 053.10 were received.

The Administration authorised on 16 January 1985 payment of R30 000 to Oranjejag as its official contribution of 50% towards the construction of a house and outbuildings at Bathurst[82], the small farm 13 km east of Bloemfontein.

The increases in annual expenses incurred by Oranjejag for hunters and hunts[83] were:

1984/85	1983/84	1982/83	1981/82	1980/81
412 064	348 666	330 392	272 806	254 333

1985/86 – Cape Province

In line with its policy, the Cape Department of Nature and Environmental Conservation[84] continued to transfer responsibility for problem animal control to Divisional Councils and landowners. Training and research in improved techniques and methods remained an important contribution by the Department.

The Department sold 10 625 cyanide cartridges (shells), 1 949 coyote getters, 7 hunt hounds and 814 bait flasks (500 g) to Divisional Councils and farmers.

The following 100 animals were caught or killed with Departmental problem animal control measures: 48 black-backed jackals (19 - coyote getters/29 - hounds), 1 Cape fox (coyote getter), 15 vagrant dogs (coyote getters), 3 other viverridae spp. (coyote getters), 24 caracals (hounds), 1 leopard (hounds), 7 bush pigs (hounds) and 1 African porcupine (cage trap).

Damage caused by leopards was also managed in the Province[85].

1985/86 – Orange Free State Province

On 1 April 1985, the Director of Oranjejag requested the Administration for payment of the annual subsidy; on 10 April 1985, the Administration approved payment of R317 262 to Oranjejag[86] as subsidy for the 1985/86 financial year.

Version 5.0 - ITO de Vlaar - Version 5.0

[82] File N12/7/4 – Payment form (dated 16 January 1985) and letters (dated 31 October 1984 & 10 January 1985).
[83] Oranjejag Bloemfontein Financial Statements – 31 March 1985.
[84] Anonymous, 1985/1986. Probleemdierbeheer. Kaapse Departement van Natuur- en Omgewingsbewaring. Verslag Nr. 42. pp. 23-62.
[85] Information regarding control of damage-causing leopards.

Divisional Council	Permits issued	Leopards caught	Livestock losses	
			Small livestock	Cattle
Bredasdorp/Swellendam	6	-	46	2
Cederberg	13	2	60	2
Humansdorp	9	4	89	10
Klein Karoo/Langkloof	7	3	29	1
Koup	1	-	1	-
Langeberg	2	1	24	-
Namaqualand	6	1	41	1
Outeniqua	2	1	4	-
Winterhoek	2	-	5	1
Witzenberg	20	6	92	-
Totals	55	13	367	24

[86] File N12/7/4 – handwritten note on the letter dated 1 April 1981.

The scales for Oranjejag's subscription tariffs were changed from 1985[87].

In a letter dated 14 April 1986, Oranjejag confirmed to the Director of Nature Conservation that membership was 2 609 and that subscriptions to the value of R103 335.90 were received.

The Director of Nature Conservation, Mr. P.J. le Roux provided the Provincial Auditor[88] with a summary of the members of Oranjejag and the annual subscriptions received for the period 1973/74 to 1984/85, as well as its voluntary membership since 1 April 1973[89].

1986/87 – Orange Free State Province

The Director of Oranjejag requested the Administration on 1 April 1986 for payment of the annual subsidy to Oranjejag for the period 1 April 1986 to 31 March 1987. On 7 April 1986, the Administration paid R344 300 to Oranjejag as subsidy for the 1986/87 financial year[90].

The Administration paid an additional amount of R4 000 to Oranjejag; this amount was still outstanding on its annual subsidy, due to mandated Provincial savings which were imposed earlier during the 1986/87 financial year[91].

Statistics regarding problem animal control were listed in Oranjejag's 1987 Annual Report[92] by the Chairman.

The increases in annual expenses incurred by Oranjejag for hunters and hunts[93] were:

1986/87	1985/86	1984/85	1983/84	1982/83
483 737	416 400	411 134	348 666	330 392

1987/88 – Orange Free State Province

[87] File N12/7/4 – Memo dated 19 February 1986.
[88] Memo N12/7/4 of 6 May 1985 – Nature Conservation to Auditor: Orange Free State Province
[89] Membership numbers and annual subscription fees collected by Oranjejag.

Year	Number of members	Amount collected (R)
1973/74	5 200	31 420
1974/75	5 321	32 466
1975/76	4 970	64 850
1976/77	4 950	64 316
1977/78	4 655	62 818
1978/79	4 450	76 499
1979/80	4 213	73 684
1980/81	3 620	107 621
1981/82	3 480	104 697
1982/83	3 240	146 492
1983/84	3 025	136 609
1984/85	2 730	135 053

[90] File N12/7/4 – Payment form dated 7 April 1986 and Oranjejag letter dated 1 April 1986.
[91] File N12/7/4 – Payment form dated 12 March 1987 and Nature Conservation Memo dated 9 March 1987.
[92] Oranjejag 1987 Annual Report - Problem Animal Statistics per region in the Free State Province

	Caracal		Black-backed jackal		Cape fox		African wildcat		Vagrant dogs	
Region	Hounds	Cages	Hounds	Getters	Hounds	Getters	Hounds	Cages	Getters	Total
Bloemfontein	109	12	199	85	83	693	22	2	11	1216
Boshof	23	2	138	186	55	518	25		9	956
Ventersburg	1		6	284	2	604			66	963
Warden	5	9	148	105	125	869	17	2	39	1319
Total	138	23	491	660	265	2684	64	4	125	4454

[93] Oranjejag Bloemfontein Financial Statements – 31 March 1987 (approved by 4 regional annual meetings).

Version 5.0 - HG de Waal - Version 5.0

On 1 April 1987, the Director of Oranjejag requested the Administration for payment of the annual subsidy to Oranjejag for the period 1 April 1987 to 31 March 1988. On 21 April 1987, the Directorate of Nature Conservation paid R383 800 to Oranjejag as subsidy for the 1987/88 financial year[94].

In a letter dated 21 April 1987, the Director of Oranjejag confirmed its membership as being 2 780 and that subscriptions to the value of R168 998.40 were received[95].

On 23 July 1987[96], representatives of the Orange Free State and NPAs, the Natal Parks Board, Oranjejag, National Wool Growers' Association of South Africa (NWGA) Free Branch and Free State Meat Committee, held a meeting at the Sir Harry Motel[97] in Harrismith, eastern Orange Free State Province. Translated excerpts from the minutes are cited:

- Attendance register: Mr. H.J.R. Simes (MEC: Orange Free Provincial Administration - PAO), Mr. P.M. Miller (MEC: Natal Provincial Administration - NPA), Dr. G.F. Barkhuizen (Director: Nature Conservation, PAO), Mr. J.J. Blom (Division Nature Conservation, PAO), Dr. J.H. Grobler (Natal Parks Board), Mr. J. Geddes Page (Natal Parks Board), Mr. G. Nel (Chairman: Oranjejag), Mrs. E. Brand (Director: Oranjejag), Mr. T.F. Roux (Chief Inspector: Oranjejag), Adv. C.K. van Niekerk (Chairman: Verkykerskop Farmers' Association), Mr. J.P.N. van Reenen (Free State Meat Committee), Mr. A.I. Odendaal (Free Branch, NWGA) and Mr. A.M.J. Brooks (Oranjejag).
- Mr. A.I. Odendaal chaired the meeting and welcomed everybody, especially Mr. H.J.R. Simes and Mr. P.M. Miller.
- Given the serious decline in wool production in this area, the Head of the NWGA gave permission for a meeting between the two provinces and Oranjejag to find a solution for the damage-causing predators.
- Mr. A.I. Odendaal said that it was common knowledge that predators were migrating from Natal and, although Oranjejag provided a good service in this area, the hunters were not allowed to cross the provincial boundary and enter Natal.
- Mr. H.J.R. Simes said that damage-causing animals would always be present but this area already had a specific problem. He emphasised the importance of wool as an earner of foreign exchange. Government supported the change from crop production to the livestock factor but everybody was aware of the negative effects of kraaling at night on wool quality, condition of the animals and trampling of veld, therefore the meeting should deal with a very important challenge. Damage-causing animals were migrating across the provincial borders from the Cape, Natal and Transvaal Provinces. The PAO was already making a huge financial contribution to the work of Oranjejag. Funds were not unlimited; therefore, farmers would have to increase their contributions to ensure a quality service.
- Mr. P.M. Miller thanked Mr. Simes for the welcoming at the meeting. Natal had a new approach towards farmers who were controlling damage-causing animals and the Provincial Administration would strive to increase cooperation with the Free State province regarding the problem. They made use of scientists and recently Prof. Boddicker of the USA presented lectures that were attended by Free State farmers.
- Mr. A.M.J. Brooks said he owned properties in both provinces. In the Free State, he contacted Oranjejag for assistance but did not know whom to contact for assistance in Natal. He also mentioned that black people were allowed to keep dogs and hunt damage-causing animals in both provinces, but in the process, the dogs also decimated wildlife such as small antelope and birds.

[94] File N12/7/4 – Memo dated 16 April 1987.
[95] File N12/7/4 – Oranjejag letter dated 21 April 1987
[96] File WK 40/1, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[97] Editor's Note: The first initiative to coordinate predation management in South Africa at a national level.

Version 5.0 - Hoole de Waal - Version 5.0

- Mr. A.I. Odendaal referred to recent losses on his farm in Natal: in three nights, 71 sheep were killed and 45 injured. He contacted the Natal Parks Board and, although assistance was rendered, no success was achieved.
- Adv. C.K. van Niekerk said that at a meeting of Oranjejag's Region 4 (Warden), it was proposed to increase subscriptions by 50% to improve the existing services.
- Mr. J.P.N. van Reenen said that although several farmers, including himself, have switched from small livestock to cattle, predators also killed young calves.
- Dr. G.F. Barkhuizen said everybody was fully aware of the problem. Although the Free State Provincial Administration was very sympathetic and made a huge contribution, he was of the opinion that the wool and meat industry should also contribute towards controlling damage-causing animals.
- Dr. J.H. Grobler said the increase in damage-causing animals was a countrywide phenomenon, especially for black-backed jackals and caracals. In Natal the damage-causing animals were controlled in the nature Reserves. Their approach was to provide extension to farmers to enable them to control damage-causing animals themselves.
- Mr. A.I. Odendaal inquired whether Free State farmers with adjacent land in Natal could include it provisionally in their current Oranjejag subscription to enable the hunters to provide the services also on those properties.
- Mr. P.M. Miller said he had no objection to cross the Natal provincial border provided they have permission of the landowners. Furthermore, if there was sufficient interest the farmers may form a hunt club and become eligible for a subsidy from the NPA as well as assistance from Natal Parks Board. A club may be founded if the majority farmers in an area agreed and the remaining farmers were forced to join the club. Subscription was determined by the size of the land. The farmers could appoint a hunter of their choice to hunt on their behalf and remunerated the hunter from own funds.
- Mr. G. Nel cautioned that there should be no misunderstanding about Oranjejag's willingness to control damage-causing animals across the border in Natal. It cannot be expected from Oranjejag's hunters with teams of trained hounds to go across the border in pursuit of a black-backed jackal because of the following reasons: (1) it was agreed that good relations should be maintained and permission obtained from an owner before entering a property, (2) it was known that Natal farmers used poison and maybe also poison ejectors, snares and foothold traps, (3) Orange Free State funds could not be used in another province, and (4) in the event of losses with hounds damage could not be recovered from anybody and there was the danger of prosecution because of illegal trespassing on a property.
- Mr. H.J.R. Simes expressed surprise at the viewpoint of Natal and said in the Free State animals were not exterminated but only controlled. He suggested that nature conservation officials from Natal and the Free State and Oranjejag meet to discuss control methods and if there were legal obstacles, they could consult with him and Mr. Miller.
- Dr. G.F. Barkhuizen supported the view of Mr. Simes and said that Oranjejag operated in accordance with a Constitution and an Ordinance. The problems described for Natal's borders were the same for the other two provinces.
- Mr. A.I. Odendaal explained that although Harrismith was well known for its high wool yield, the sheep were in Natal for six months of the year.
- Mr. J.P.N. van Reenen said that even Free State farmers with farms in Natal were using poison on those properties and requested assistance from the authorities in Natal.
- Adv. C.K. van Niekerk said he thought there was a solution and proposed that NGWA representatives and nature conservation officials of all four provinces meet to discuss the matter of borders. The NWGA should take the lead in this initiative.
- Dr. J.H. Grobler of the Natal Parks Board responded and said that there was already a committee comprising nature conservation officials of the four provinces. He confirmed that although it was legal to use poison in Natal, it was discouraged. The Natal Parks Board killed

Version 5.0 - Incorrect version 5.0

damage-causing animals where they were bordering on livestock farms. A student was appointed to conduct research and determine which animals were causing most losses, namely vagrant dogs, black-backed jackals or caracals.

- Mr. J. Geddes Page said there was an improvement in the attitude between the Natal Parks Board and livestock farmers as well as the approach towards damage-causing animals.
- Dr. G.F. Barkhuizen asked whether farmers realised how valuable their product was. The Free State Department of Nature Conservation has tasked an official to conduct research in cooperation with Oranjejag on the caracal and black-backed jackal. He confirmed that Oranjejag hunted in the Free State's Nature Reserves. When private nature reserves refused without good reasons access to Oranjejag's hunter, he would have to consider amending the Ordinance governing private nature reserves.
- Mr. H.J.R. Simes said the discussions were only the beginning of a process of broader discussions and understanding of the problems between the two provinces.
- Mr. A.M.J. Brooks reported that 4 454 damage-causing animals were killed by Oranjejag in the past financial year in the Free State Province, indicating that Oranjejag was definitely functioning effectively.
- Mr. A.I. Odendaal thanked those present for their attitude and understanding during the discussions and that it would be conveyed to the NWGA and the Meat Committee.
- The meeting adjourned at 12h30...

A letter dated 17 August 1987[98] the PAO referred to a motion regarding dingo's at the NWGA's Congress and informed Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) that a complete ban was placed on the future keeping of dingoes in the Province. Permits for keeping dingoes which were already in private possession, would only be issued if a veterinarian provided a certificate that the animal was sterilised. This matter would also be discussed on 10 September 1987 at a meeting of provincial heads of nature conservation.

Following a telephone conversation the previous day, Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) requested Mr. H.J.R. Simes, MEC: PAO in a letter, dated 3 September 1987[99] to assist in arranging a meeting with his counterpart colleagues from all four provinces. At a recent meeting of the NWGA's Central Management in Bloemfontein, a Problem Animal Sub-committee was formed to engage with senior officials and explore ways to control problem animals more effectively. The Sub-committee comprised Mr. A.P. Pretorius (President: Natal and East Griqualand NWGA Branch), Mr. B.P. Johnstone (President: Transvaal NWGA Branch), Mr. A.I. Odendaal (Member of the Management Committee of the Free State NWGA Branch) and Mr. P.F. Hugo (MP and Member of the Management Committee, Cape NWGA Branch). Several aspects were highlighted in the letter, namely:

- In addition to huge financial losses incurred by small livestock farmers, the damage caused by predation also impeded expanding wool production in areas affected by predation losses.
- Repeated motions were adopted at NWGA congresses regarding the damage-causing animals without any real progress being made. Appreciation was however expressed for the contribution by Oranjejag in controlling damage-causing animals in the Orange Free State Province.
- There was an apparent failure by the different provincial departments to coordinate activities, especially along common provincial borders.
- Appreciation was expressed for the progress made during a recent meeting in Harrismith (23 July 1987) which was attended also by the Natal Parks Board and NPA.

[98] File N3/2/1 – Letter dated 1987-08-17 by Dr. G.F. Barkhuizen, Director Environment and Nature Conservation, Orange Free State Provincial Administration.
[99] File WK 40/1, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.

Version 5.0 – Do de Waal – Version 5.0

- It was suggested that representatives of the Agricultural Union or Hunt Associations might also be involved in the envisaged meeting with the four provincial MEC's.

In its letter dated 24 September 1987[100], the PAO referred Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) to a request by the NWGA for a complete ban on the keeping of dingoes. The request was brought to the attention of the other provincial heads of nature conservation at a meeting on 10 September 1987 and they undertook to attend to the matter. It was suggested the NWGA should also inquire in due course with the respective provincial authorities.

Mr. H.J.R. Simes, MEC: PAO replied in a letter on 6 October 1987[101]. Mr. Simes remained sympathetic to the NWGA's request, but unforeseen circumstances popped up which prevented him from passing the request on to his counterparts in the other three provinces. He confidentially confided with Mr. Theuns Botha about the Treasury's instruction to the PAO to cut expenditure drastically; he suspected the other provinces received similar instructions. The drastic cut in expenditure would inevitably also affect the funding and thus activities of Oranjejag in controlling damage-causing predators. Given this uncertainty, he considered it injudicious to contact the other provinces with a request that will commit them to increase expenditure to control damage-causing predators. Mr. Simes requested Mr. Theuns Botha to convey this situation in confidence to the NWGA's Central Management. He also suggested the latter might consider approaching the Minister of Agriculture directly regarding the negative impact of predation and inquire if the Minister may be willing to approach the Treasury to release additional funds for this worthy case.

In a memorandum, dated 12 October 1987[102], Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) informed the Problem Animal Sub-committee, namely Messrs. A.P. Pretorius, A.I. Odendaal, B.P. Johnstone, P.F. Hugo, G. du Plessis and M. van Dyk (South African Agricultural Union) about the confidential message received from Mr. H.J.R. Simes. He also said that before Mr. H.J.R. Simes's letter was received, the matter of predation was broached at a meeting of the Red Meat Producers' Organisation (RPO) in Pretoria. The RPO's Small livestock Committee nominated Mr. G. du Plessis as representative on the NWGA's Problem Animal Sub-committee. Mr. Theuns Botha also urgently requested advice about the road forward regarding the information received from Mr. H.J.R. Simes. Furthermore, the members of the Problem Animal Sub-committee should inquire with the MEC's in their respective provinces about their views of an envisaged meeting as originally suggested. In preparation for such an envisaged meeting, it was suggested the Problem Animal Sub-committee should define the nature and extent of predation and plan a possible strategy. Once such arrangements have been made, the matter may also be taken forward by the SAAU to approach the Minister of Agriculture.

In a letter, dated 3 November 1987, Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) informed the members of the Problem Animal Sub-committee and Mr. G. du Plessis that a meeting was provisionally scheduled for 8 December 1987 at 17h00 in Port Elizabeth. The strategy and further planning for action would be discussed at the meeting.

In a letter dated 24 November 1987[103], Mrs. Ester Brand (Director: Oranjejag) provided Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) with copies of the following: (1) Minutes of the meeting between the Provincial Administrations of Natal and Free State and other stakeholders (23 July 1987 in Harrismith), (2) 1987 Annual Report by the Chairman of Oranjejag, and (3)

[100] File N10/1/4/1 – Letter dated 24 September 1987 by Dr. Barkhuizen, Director Environment and Nature Conservation, Orange Free State Provincial Administration.
[101] File WK 40/1, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[102] File WK 40/1, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[103] File WK 40/1, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.

Version 5.0 - HC de Waal - Version 5.0

Monthly records of damage-causing animals killed in the four regions of Oranjejag. She also referred to increasing problems encountered with caracals and black-backed jackals migrating across the Free State provincial borders. Furthermore, the previous week Oranjejag was given permission to hunt for a few days on the De Beer's grounds and was astonished by the large number of black-backed jackals; 15 were caught in three days with trained hound packs. As alluded to during the discussions many problems were experienced on the Natal border. Mrs. Brand said all financial support was welcomed, because Oranjejag wanted to appoint additional personnel to address the increasing problems. Any further information would be gladly provided at request.

Mrs. Ester Brand: Director Oranjejag attached a copy of the 'Oranjejag – Chairman's Annual Report[104] – 1987' to the letter dated 14 November 1987.

- Mr. G. Nel, Chairperson said it was a pleasure to welcome all present at the 17th Regional Annual Meeting of the association.
- They were looking forward to receive hints and proposals to improve the organisation to develop the association.
- Membership
- Membership increased that year from 2 680 to 2 780. The executive thanked all the old members for their loyal support and the new members were welcomed with the expectation that their mutual effort would strengthen Oranjejag.
- The Chief Inspector, Mr. Tom Roux and Mr. Nel addressed several District Farmer Unions, as well as Farmers' Associations, and were able to remove uncertainties and misperceptions regarding Oranjejag. They thanked those who made it possible to address the meetings because they reached farmers who were not fully informed about Oranjejag. They were willing to meet at any time and place during the next year at the request of groups of farmers. They should contact the Director in Bloemfontein to arrange a mutual date for such meetings. It was the only effective way to convey the case of Oranjejag also to non-members.
- Harmful[105] animals killed
- The following animals were killed during the year and compared to data for the previous three years:

	1984	1985	1986	1987
Hyaenas	-	3	1	1
Caracals	129	139	174	161
Black-backed jackals	619	1 127	1 092	1 151
Silver foxes	2 590	2 288	2 559	2 049
African wildcats	76	70	89	68
Vagrant dogs	207	193	156	125
Total	3 921	3 820	4 071	4 454

- The 4 454 harmful animals killed during the year were 383 more than the previous year. The 1 151 black-backed jackals killed were the most recorded by Oranjejag in any year. It was observed countrywide that harmful animals were increasing. Scientist could not yet determine an acceptable cause for the increase. In many parts of the Republic – among other in parts of Transvaal – harmful animals was such a problem that small livestock farming could not be practiced profitable anymore. Fortunately, for livestock farmers in the Orange Free State, the foresight of the founders of Oranjejag established the organisation. Since the founding of Oranjejag, 80 581 harmful animals have been killed. Of the 4 454 harmful animals killed that year, 78% were killed with poison ejectors and 0.6 in cage traps. The latter seemed small, but it must be borne in mind that it represented 14% of all the caracal killed. A request was made that all harmful animals caught in trap cages should be reported to the office.

[104] File WK 40/1, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[105] Editor's Note: In many older publications references to damage-causing animals were interchanged with terms such as 'problem animals', 'vermin' and 'problem animals'.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

- The following harmful animals were killed in the different regions:

	Caracal		Black-backed jackal		Cape fox		African wildcat		Vagrant dogs	Total
	Hound	Gette[1]r	Hound	Getter	Hound	Getter	Hound	Cage[2]		
Bloemfontein	109	12	199	85	83	693	22	2	11	1 216
Boshof	23	12	138	186	55	518	25	-	9	956
Ventersburg	1	2	6	284	2	604	-	-	66	963
Warden	5	-	148	105	125	860	17	2	39	1 319
Total	138	23	491	660	265	2 684	64	4	125	4 454

[1] Coyote getter – poison ejector
[2] Cage trap

- Curing of skins
- A friendly reminder was given that harmful animals killed with poison ejectors or in caught in trap cages, must be skinned according to the guidelines and kept until a hunted came to fetch it. The money earned thus by Oranjejag assisted to curb costs. The past year R3 800.00 were earned which was an increase of R1 200.00 over the previous year.
- Putting out poison
- Several farmers again put out poison and it caused big losses to Oranjejag. It was a criminal offence to put poison out in the Orange Free State and Oranjejag cannot hunt with hounds in that area.
- Farmers were reminded of their noble profession – they should be proud about the level of development, and then why not use more appropriate methods to eliminate harmful animals? Innocent birds and animals were killed with poison and it was time to strengthen the hands of Oranjejag. When they were aware of poison being put out in their area they should immediately report it. They also thanked the Orange Free State Authority for having made it illegal to put poison out in the province.
- Hounds
- Oranjejag had 207 trained hounds, which were grouped in 17 teams. They comprise 110 tracker hounds, 57 grey hounds and 40 nondescripts. There were 77 young hounds. They comprise 43 tracker pups, 17 grey hounds and 17 young nondescripts. At the beginning of the previous year, there were many mortalities among young hounds and pups. The personnel at the Main Station were thanked for their unwavering efforts to identify the problem and correct it bringing mortalities under control.
- Shows
- Several exhibitions were made at shows and based on the interests and inquiries it proved to be a great success. The association planned to visit shows in future.
- Provincial Administration
- As reported in the Financial Statement, the financial contribution of the Provincial Administration was R348 300.00 for the year. Without the contribution, Oranjejag would not have been able to function. On behalf of all the members, they thanked the Administrator and Executive Committee for their positive attitude towards the organisation as well as the funds. Dr. Barkhuizen, Director of Nature Conservation in the Orange Free State was especially thanked for his contribution. It was hoped they could continue working together with such a good attitude.
- Personnel
- Office personnel: Mrs Brand, Director; Mrs. Pienaar, Bookkeeper and Mrs. Kriel General Clark.
- Field personnel: Chief Inspector: Mr. Roux; Inspectors: Messrs. Clasn, Strydom, Geyer and De Wet. Hunters: Messrs. Wilke, Kok, Barnard, Swanepoel, Brümmer, Nel and Annandale. There were also 25 black personnel in employment.
- He thanked Mrs. Brand, as well as the office personnel, for their good services provided during the past year.

Version 5.0 - HD de Waal - Version 5.0

- He thanked Mr. Tom Roux, the Chief Inspector, for always giving Oranjejag priority and for the good services and his cooperation. He thanked the Inspectors at the substations and conveyed his pride for their work and the neatness of their stations.
- He expressed sincere condolences with the passing of Mr. Jan Marais of Boshof on 28 November 1986. Sincere condolences were offered to his family. They had two more hunters and thus being able to provide a better service. The number of harmful animals killed the past year was testimony to the good work of the white and black hunters. Kilometres travelled was the biggest single expense, therefore he called on hunters to continue traveling judiciously without compromising efficacy.
- All the staff, white and black, were commended for their contributions the past year. A special thanks to the ladies at the stations who handled the phone calls.
- Floating trophies
- As for the past few years, Inspector Clasn again won the Tewie Wessels and the H.O. van Graan floating trophies. He congratulated Casper with the achievement. He killed a total of 957 animals, including 286 black-backed jackals. The previous years it was discussed at the Regional Annual Meetings it was discussed if the present allocation of marks were correct. The Executive debated the matter and was pleased to report that the Executive was in the process of finalising a new formula.
- Subscriptions
- The Executive considered it necessary to increase the annual subscriptions from 1 April 1988:

  Properties smaller than 999 ha – from R37.00 to R50.00/year
  From 1 000 ha to 2 999 ha – from R75.00 to R100.00/year
  From 3 000 ha to 6 999 ha – from R112.00 to R1500.00/year
  Properties larger than 7 000 ha – from R150.00 to R200.00/year
- The increases were the result of salary increases, travelling costs, the feeding of hounds and other necessary expenses.
- Sincere thanks and appreciation was expressed to the Deputy Chairperson Mr. T.D. Potgieter as well as the rest of the Executive for their wholehearted cooperation the past year. Their positive attitude and support made his work as Chairperson easier. He trusted the association would grow further during the next year.
- Condolences was extended to the families of Oranjejag who passed on during the year. Heartfelt sympathy was extended towards those farmers who had to leave the industry because of financial problems.
- Finally, the Maker was thanked for His the grace during the year. He determined the fate of everybody.
- Everybody was wished a safe journey back home.

Mrs. Ester Brand: Director Oranjejag attached a copy of the 'Harmful animals killed & kilometres driven Jan-Oct 1986'[106] to the letter dated 14 November 1987; summarised below:

Month	km[1]	Caracal		Black-backed jackal		Cape fox		African wildcat		Vagrant dog	**Total**
		Hound	Getter[2]	Hound	Getter	Hound	Getter	Hound	Cage[3]		
Jan	33 467	2	9	27	30	23	55	2	-	3	151
Feb	40 254	6	-	44	61	36	113	4	-	11	275
Mar	37 965	10	1	18	77	10	133	6	-	13	263
Apr	43 809	12	2	24	68	25	306	3	-	7	447
May	39 943	10	1	13	49	21	324	5	-	14	437
Jun	44 617	13	1	6	71	15	487	5	-	13	611
Jul	51 102	1	-	12	71	16	468	4	1	26	614
Aug	36 972	9	1	9	32	21	182	5	-	9	268
Sep	41 461	18	1	50	45	22	209	9	-	8	362
Oct	54 524	11	9	88	59	45	181	7	-	12	412

[106] File WK 40/1, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.

Version 5.0 - Pro de Waal - Version 5.0

Total	424 114	92	11	291	563	234	2 458	50	1	116	3840

[1] Main Station (Bloemfontein): Chief Insp. T.F. Roux, Insp. D.S. de Wet, Hunters J.J.W. Swanepoel, J. Kok, J. Barnard, F.P. Kotze, G. Annandale, J.A. Brummer, A.P. Nel; Boshof: Insp. W.P. Geyer & Hunter J.J. Marais; Ventersburg: Insp. C. Clasn & Hunter P.E. Maritz; Warden: Insp. J.C. Strydom & R.J. Wilke. [Some hunters were moved between stations.]
[2] Coyote getter – poison ejector
[3] Cage trap

Mrs. Ester Brand: Director Oranjejag attached a copy of the 'Harmful animals killed & kilometres driven Jan-Oct 1987'[107] to the letter dated 14 November 1987; summarised below:

Month	km[1]	Caracal		Black-backed jackal		Cape fox		African wildcat		Vagrant dog	**Total**
		Hound	Getter[2]	Hound	Getter	Hound	Getter	Hound	Cage[3]		
Jan	39 440	6	2	61	47	16	90	2	-	2	226
Feb	34 806	11	-	32	66	13	106	3	-	8	239
Mar	50 802	7	4	37	88	22	141	11	1	6	317
Apr	49 497	10	-	18	61	22	264	5	-	23	403
May	53 704	10	2	20	53	20	304	5	-	13	427
Jun	59 213	15	1	16	54	9	237	1	-	17	440
Jul	49 652	8	3	19	47	9	238	3	1	12	340
Aug	43 491	9	5	19	47	4	233	7	1	14	339
Sep	56 378	18	3	125	51	17	160	7	1	16	398
Oct	43 546	15	1	100	40	24	140	15	-	11	346
Total	480 529	109	15	447	554	156	1913	59	3	122	3475

[1] Main Station (Bloemfontein): Chief Insp. T.F. Roux, Insp. D.S. de Wet, Hunters J.J.W. Swanepoel, J. Kok, J. Barnard, F.P. Kotze, G. Annandale, J.A. Brummer, A.P. Nel; Boshof: Insp. W.P. Geyer & Hunter J.J. Marais; Ventersburg: Insp. C. Clasn & Hunter P.E. Maritz; Warden: Insp. J.C. Strydom & R.J. Wilke. [plus Administrative distances travelled by Chief Insp. T.F. Roux = 28 035 km] [A hunter passed on and some were moved between stations.]
[2] Coyote getter – poison ejector
[3] Cage trap
[4] A brown hyaena was killed in January 1987 - unknown location.

Statistics regarding problem animal control were listed in Oranjejag's 1988 Annual Report[108] by the Chairman.

The Directorate Nature and Environment Conservation submitted a report[109] to the PAO regarding predation management. Although the title of the report suggested the focus was on caracal only, results and information on other predators such as the black-backed jackal, Cape fox, African wildcat, brown hyaena and vagrant dogs were also included. Since 1966, Oranjejag was mandated to manage the damage caused by predators to small livestock in the Province. According to the Ordinance for Nature Conservation, Ordinance No. 8 of 1969, the Directorate was responsible to provide for "*the conservation of animals and plants and the hunting of animals that cause damage and for matters related to it.*" Therefore, the Directorate was responsible for ensuring that the predator control policy was based on accepted ecological principles.

Version 5.0 - Vode Waal - Version 5.0

[107] File WK 40/1, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.

[108] Oranjejag 1988 Annual Report - Problem Animal Statistics per region in the Free State Province

	Brown hyaena	Caracal		Black-backed jackal		Cape fox		African wildcat		Vagrant dogs	
Region	Getters	Hounds	Cages	Hounds	Getters	Hounds	Getters	Hounds	Cages	Getters	Total
Bloemfontein		77	17	166	75	63	515	24	2	26	965
Boshof		27	2	194	131	40	373	28	1	7	803
Ventersburg		10		44	268	8	492	3		83	908
Warden	1	3	3	160	81	61	594	16		21	940
Total	1	117	22	564	555	172	1974	71	3	137	3616

[109] Ferreira, N.A., 1988. Sekere aspekte van die ekologie en die beheer van die rooikat (*Felis caracal*) in die Oranje-Vrystaat. Project N7/7/5, dated May 1988.

The report reflected on the existing strategy to control damage by predators and if it was still effective and specifically cost-effective; the following were highlighted:

- The organised control of predators in the small livestock producing areas of the Orange Free State Province and adjacent regions can be traced to the recommendations of the Drought Investigating Commission of 1922[110]. The livestock mortalities experienced during the drought of 1919 were largely attributed to the poor veld and animal management practices of farmers, namely the destructive effects on natural pasture and the condition of small livestock when they were kraaled every night. The Commission recommended that black-backed jackals must be exterminated before the farmers would consider adopting alternative grazing practices. As a result, jackal-proof fencing of farms was made compulsory in certain areas and the farmers were subsidised; farmers were responsible to erect and maintain the subsidised fences[111].
- The serious view taken of the damage caused by black-backed jackals and their control during the 1950s was demonstrated by the existence and official subsidising of three large hunt associations in the eastern, southern and south-western districts of the Province; each operating over areas of more than 850 000 ha. A further 34 small private hunt associations (not subsidised) were also active in the southern districts of the Orange Free State Province. Official subsidising of the three large hunt associations was stopped from 1 April 1963, but they could not survive financially during the following three years.
- A large hunt association, Oranjejag was officially proclaimed on 24 December 1965[112] [Note: initially Oranjejag operated only in 36 districts and from 1 April 1967 the 12 remaining districts of the Orange Free State Province were included by proclamation[113].]
- Membership of Oranjejag was compulsory from 1966 for all landowners and the members reached a peak of 15 904 in 1970.
- From 1966, Oranjejag followed an intensive control policy and carried out both preventative and reactive follow-up predator control.
- At the peak of activities in 1970, Oranjejag employed 20 hunters with 1 000 hounds.
- Membership of Oranjejag became voluntary from April 1971 (Ordinance No. 8 of 1971) and membership declined sharply to 5 200 in 1973; over the period 1973/74 to 1987/88, the voluntary membership of Oranjejag declined further from 5 200 to 2 796.
- Because of less revenue generated from fewer members, Oranjejag had to reduce the number of hunters to 10 with 250 hounds.
- In 1973 the farms of Oranjejag's members covered about 5 205 000 ha (43% of the Orange Free State Province) and with the decline in its membership this area was reduced to 2 611 609 ha (21% of the Province).
- From 1973, Oranjejag changed its policy and only conducted reactive follow-up predator control.
- During the period 1972/73 to 1987/88, voluntary subscriptions covered on average only 31.8% of Oranjejag's annual expenses, despite several increases in annual tariffs.
- Being made aware of the recurring financial predicament of Oranjejag and requiring additional funding from the Administration, the annual subsidy of Oranjejag was limited to 70% of its annual budget; the expenditure of the 1979/80 financial year served as baseline and providing for an annual increment of 10%. However, from 1979 to 1988, the inflation rate varied between 11.7 and 18%; thus the income base of Oranjejag declined annually during this period.

[110] Van Rheenen, R.J., 1935. Resisting drought. The Government Printer, Pretoria.
[111] "*Wysigingswet op Omheinings*", Act 11 of 1922.
[112] Official Gazette, Province of the Orange Free State, No. 57. Friday, 24th December, 1965. Proclamation No. 267 of 1965.
[113] Extraordinary Official Gazette, Province of the Orange Free State, No. 11. Friday, 3rd March, 1967. Proclamation No. 46 of 1967.

Version 5.0 - NC 00 Wait - Version 5.0

- A survey of a sample of Oranjejag's members showed that farmers had complemented the predator control activities of Oranjejag by using additional methods such as greyhounds (23.5%), cage traps (32.3%), foothold traps (23.5%) and evading predation by moving small livestock to safer areas (11.8%).
- Many respondents complained about the long interval between reporting cases of predation and the actual response by Oranjejag's hunters to attend to the complaints.
- The way in which Oranjejag reported its hunt results appeared spectacular on paper, but the results were analysed quasi-scientifically and was very misleading.
- Oranjejag did not mention the numbers of complaints that had been successfully resolved or the members who were satisfied with the service; the survey only showed that 25% of cases (60 of 267 complaints) were resolved satisfactorily over a period of eight years for a sample of its members.
- The report concluded: "*A fundamental error in judgement was made in 1965 by the Administration when it created a milieu for the small livestock owner to shift the responsibility for predator control on his farm to a hunt association, namely Oranjejag*." Furthermore, *"Over the past 20 years the landowner in the Province was not taught techniques to reduce part of the predation losses on his farm himself.*"
- Lastly, it was stated: *"It is clear that the current system of predation control is not effective in spite of the large sums of money and available expertise, therefore, a more effective control system must be found.*"

The report to the PAO recommended the following:

- Private initiative must be encouraged with limited subsidising of small private hunt clubs and guiding legislation.
- Provide good training of landowners with practical demonstrations of control techniques and the principles of cost-effective control.
- Implement a shift in the function of Oranjejag from total responsibility for predation control to support and assistance.
- Provide attractive basic salaries to the hunters of Oranjejag.
- Improve the image of Oranjejag among the public.
- Establish an advisory committee representative of scientific nature conservationists, organised agriculture and the National Museum.

Ostensibly, the Provincial Administration heeded the report and its recommendations and considered making major changes in its predation management policy.

The NWGA's Problem Animal Sub-committee held a meeting on 8 December 1987 in Port Elizabeth[114]. It was attended by Mr. P.F. Hugo (MP and Cape NWGA Branch), Mr. A.P. Pretorius (Natal and East Griqualand NWGA Branch), Mr. B.P. Johnstone (Transvaal NWGA Branch), Mr. J.L. van der Walt (Manager RPO), Mr. T.F.J. Botha (Manager: NWGA), Mr. P.S. Buys (General Secretary: NWGA) and Miss. C. van der Westhuizen (Operational Assistant). Apologies were accepted for Mr. A.I. Odendaal (Free State NWGA Branch) and Mr. G. du Plessis (RPO's Small livestock Committee). The following translated excerpts from the minutes are cited:

- Mr. P.F. Hugo opened the meeting with a prayer.
- Mr. P.F. Hugo was named unanimously as Chairman.
- Mr. P.F. Hugo said the damage caused by problem animals must be viewed seriously. The losses incurred annually in the Cape Province amounts to about R45 million, and for the country about R150-R250 million. He referred to the services provided by the different

[114] File WK 40/1, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

provincial administrations in controlling damage-causing animals. In discussions, he told the CPA that they have failed the farmers in controlling damage-causing animals effectively. It is obvious that farmers will have to make larger contributions in order to survive this problem economically. The provincial administrations, specifically in the Cape Province will not be able to handle it on their own. Farmers must be trained to solve the problems themselves. The CPA was in support of the idea that farmers take the lead and train their workers to tackle the problem. With regard to the financial aspects, Mr. Hugo said farmers could not bear the costs themselves. He suggested that training should be the responsibility of an overarching body. The RSCs can take the lead by appointing a liaison officer to coordinate training countrywide in an organised manner. He emphasised that a farmer cannot train workers on his own, but the government must contribute.

- Summary: South African farmers must act independently to solve the problem, but the government must be approached to provide some services. Farmers must be provided the opportunity from the level of the farmer's association to take decision in the RSCs to enable them to act in a coordinated manner.
- Mr. P.F. Hugo referred to Oranjejag's meeting (minutes - 23 July 1987, p 2) where it was indicated that farmers experiencing problem in the Free State may approach Oranjejag. In Natal, there is not a comparable organisation to assist. They have serious problems that must be addressed. He emphasised that not all damage-causing animals can be exterminated, but they must be controlled. He also referred to statement by Mr. Odendaal (meeting of 23 July 1987, paragraph 4) that a large number of sheep were killed in three nights and the failure of the Natal Parks Board to assist him successfully.
- Mr. Theuns Botha alluded to the fact that Mr. Simes was requested to take the lead in organising a meeting between MEC's of the four provinces. However, unexpected restrictions were placed by Treasury on expenditure by the provinces, thus it was not wise to arrange the meeting with MEC's; the confidential letter of Mr. H.J.R. Simes in this regard was noted.
- Mr. A.P. Pretorius said there were no dingoes in Natal and Mr. Hugo said the few dingoes in the Cape Province were all sterilised.
- Strategic Planning: Mr. J.L. van der Walt said that everybody seems to agree that the extent of the problem was very serious. With reference to the role of government and more specifically nature conservation, it was not clear which departments/divisions were responsible for this matter.
- Mr. P.F. Hugo said all sea fisheries/nature conservation resorts under the Provincial Administrations.
- Mr. J.L. van der Walt said the provinces had different ordinances and thus acted differently. Will the Problem Animal Sub-committee operate countrywide?
- Mr. B.P. Johnstone said it should operate on provincial basis, because if it operates countrywide it will be experience delays before a matter is given attention. He referred to the contribution of Oranjejag, expressed the opinion that they are probably not applying the staff correct, and is therefore less successful.
- Mr. A.P. Pretorius agreed the problem must be solved at provincial level, but the provinces must meet coordinated to discuss activities, where after the government can be approached jointly for assistance.
- Mr. P.F. Hugo enquired from members their views regarding the fact that farmers must solve their own problems with training.
- Mr. B.P. Johnstone in the Transvaal Province farmers tried to solve the problem themselves. There was a large increase in problem animals and voluntary clubs were established. Everybody contributed and shared for example the cost for hounds. These efforts were not successful and larger clubs were established to provide services to farmers. Farmers were levied per sheep but the method did not work well in practice. Later an organisation was established and funded by the Provincial Administration, but it was also not successful. Further investigation showed that farmers were prepared to pay per ha and later the Transvaal Federal

Version 5.0 - Houe Waal - Version 5.0

Problem Animal Association was established and a small fee was received from the Provincial Administration. There were only hunted at farmers when the clubs were affiliated. The Association's facilities were extended and later farmers paid R0.06/ha. A voluntary or compulsory scheme was introduced. The compulsory scheme required that a farmer belonging to a club and not paying his fees might be prosecuted. The clubs affiliated at the mother organisation but did not want to be linked to the Provincial Administration; the latter is however invited to attend meetings to keep informed especially where official funds are used. A white hunter is employed as head and with black hunters; other people are trained in the skills of hunting. Test hunts were conducted in parts of the Transvaal experiencing problems. These hunts were conducted over a few days and good results were obtained. According to Mr. Johnstone Oranjejag hunted only for a short period at one site and therefore their hunts were less successful.

- Mr. P.F. Hugo inquired about how successful the hunting method was in Transvaal.
- Mr. B.P. Johnstone replied that one hunt club had 97% success but then did not hunt for a long period in a specific area; therefore, farmers become disloyal and do not want to belong to the club any longer. He was of the opinion that farmers must be compelled to be a member of a hunt club. Several hunting methods are combined to solve problems. It was suggested that the Chief Hunter in Transvaal be invited to the next meeting to explain the different hunt methods.
- Mr. J.L. van der Walt referred to the new political dispensation and asked who will be the responsible authority as well as under which act it will fall?
- Mr. P.F. Hugo suggested the RSCs may be responsible and they fall under the provincial administrators. It may operate along provincial borders but an overarching organisation must be appointed to do the necessary planning and liaison. He also asked if nature conservation officials of the provinces should be invited to the next meeting to involve them in the discussions regarding problems.
- Mr. B.P. Johnstone said the Transvaal Division of Nature Conservation do not want to collaborate with the other provinces[115]. They believed farmers themselves must take the necessary initiative and only ask officials for assistance.
- Mr. A.P. Pretorius said a big education task lies ahead which must start with the farmer and then they can request assistance from the government.
- Mr. J.L. van der Walt asked who must be contacted in the event of problems.
- Mr. P.F. Hugo said the province involved is the controlling body.
- Mr. B.P. Johnstone said an overarching body must be created which will cooperate with the farmers. Farmers must be compelled to cooperate and contribute to solve the problem effectively. An increase in the fees can only be authorised by the Administrator.
- Mr. P.F. Hugo said the poison collar is apparently not successful in Transvaal. In the Cape, it is successful but it is difficult to obtain the poison. The Department of Health also oppose it in principle. According to Mr. A.P. Pretorius, the Natal Health Board is also opposing it.
- Mr. P.F. Hugo said training is of cardinal importance and emphasised the following which needs attention: (a) Better cooperation between farmers, (b) a greater willingness from farmers to spend money to control problem animals, (c) presenting short courses to farmers to help themselves, (d) training of certified hunters in all aspects of problem animal control; these hunters may be employed by farmers or hunt clubs of envisaged RSCs, (e) lectures should be incorporated in the syllabi of agricultural colleges (Grootfontein, Elsenburg, Glen, etc.), (f) legalisation of the livestock protection collar (poison collar); nature conservation departments must be requested to urgently approach the supplier of the livestock protection collar's poison (PDB 1) – Bayer SA - to make it available in the interest of conservation; a

[115] At the meeting of 20 January 1998 the underlined text was changed to read "…believed that provinces must act independently."

Version 5.0 - no de Waal - Version 5.0

similar request must be made to the mother company of Bayer in Leverkusen, Germany. The latter has indicated that such a request from nature conservation may be positively considered, and (g) legalisation of the poison "1080" in the form of bait (single-lethal-dose-drop bait). This poison bait must be manufactured, distributed and effectively administrated by a competent person.

- The meeting decided the following actions must be taken: (1) farmers must be made aware of the problem and their cooperation sought to assist in managing the problem, (2) a short article can be published in the RPO monthly journal, as well as the Golden Fleece and Landbouweekblad to ensure farmers are aware that this special committee is investigating the matter, (3) the next meeting is scheduled for 20 January 1988 and all Directors of Nature Conservation or their representatives of the different provinces will be invited to take part in discussions and establish mutual liaison [The Manager was requested to contact these people as soon as possible to explain the objective of the envisaged meeting.], (4) Mr. P.F. Hugo asked that the information which he provided to the committee be attached to the minutes, and (5) a letter addressed to the Minister of Agriculture to keep him informed about the committee which was established and its objectives.
- The Chairman, Mr. P.F. Hugo thanked everybody present for his or her contributions. He envisaged only positive actions/cooperation that will be of incalculable value to livestock farmers.
- The meeting adopted a motion of appreciation for the Chair and departed.

On 28 December 1987[116], Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) informed Mr. P.F. (Piet) Hugo, MP and Chairman of the NWGA's Problem Animal Sub-committee that a meeting was scheduled for 20 January 1988 in Port Elizabeth. He requested Mr. Hugo to provide items to be included on the agenda.

1988 – Cape Province

In a letter dated 7 January 1988[117] to the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. J.J.G. Wentzel (MP), Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) addressed important aspects regarding the impact of damage-causing animals, namely:

- The Minister's attention was drawn to press reports that reflected on the increasing huge costs incurred by farmers because of damage-causing animals.
- Reputable sources estimated the annual losses of livestock in the Cape Province amounted to R45 million and countrywide it was about R250 million per annum.
- In the Drakensberg grazing region, the impact of predation is impeding expansion of wool production. At the request of the NWGA, the SA Wool Board provided an additional R8 000 to study the hunting behaviour of damage-causing animals which are proliferating in conservation areas and adjacent farms. The research was conducted in cooperation with the NPA and the University of Natal. Several research projects have been conducted and are continued to be conducted by the respective provincial divisions of nature conservation.
- The problems of damage-causing animals have repeatedly been debated at NWGA congresses and pleas for assistance issues, .the NWGA decided to establish a Problem Animal Sub-committee comprising representatives nationwide from organised agriculture. Mr. Piet Hugo, MP for Beaufort West, chairs the Sub-committee.
- At its first meeting, the Problem Animal Sub-committee decided to concentrate on the following goals: (a) strife to improve cooperation of farmers to tackle the problem jointly, (b) a greater willingness of farmers to spend money for controlling damage-causing animals, (c) conducting short courses for farmers to help themselves, (d) training of more certified hunters in all aspects of damage-causing animal control; these hunters may be employed by farmers

[116] File WK 40/1, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[117] File WK 40/1, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

or hunt clubs or envisaged RSCs, (e) lectures regarding damage-causing control should be incorporated in the syllabi of agricultural colleges (Grootfontein, Elsenburg, Glen, etc.), (f) legalisation of the livestock protection collar (poison collar); nature conservation departments must be requested to urgently approach the supplier of the livestock protection collar's poison (PDB 1) – Bayer SA - to make it available in the interest of conservation; a similar request must be made to the mother company of Bayer in Leverkusen, Germany. The latter has indicated that such a request from nature conservation may be positively considered, and (g) legalisation of the poison "1080" in the form of bait (single-lethal-dose-drop bait). This poison bait must be manufactured, distributed and effectively administrated by a competent person.

- The next meeting of the Problem Animal Sub-committee was scheduled for 20 January 1988 in Port Elizabeth. Representatives of all four provincial departments of nature conservation were invited for discussions and to devise a plan of action to address the problem in a coordinated way.
- The goal is not to disregard the laws of nature and is opposed to the indiscriminate extermination of these animals. The objective is to find effective control methods to enable farmers faced by these challenges to survive economically.
- It was also recognised that government's funds are limited; therefore, the farmers want to find a way first to help themselves. Farmers are convinced that if they do their part, there will be the necessary sympathy of government to avail funds for training or any other aspect in this regard when needed.
- In view of the above, the liberty was taken to approach the Minister at an early stage in this matter. The Minister will be kept fully informed regarding planning and the progress. Mr. Hugo will also use every available opportunity to inform the Minister personally regarding the matter.

On 7 January 1988, Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) invited[118] Dr. G. Hughes (Director: Natal Parks Board), Mr. Niel van Wyk (Deputy Director: Nature Conservation, Cape Province), Dr. G.F. Barkhuizen (Director: Environment and Nature Conservation, Orange Free State Province) and Dr. P.F.S. Milder (Director: Nature Conservation, Transvaal Province) to the meeting of the Problem Animal Sub-committee which was scheduled for 20 January 1988 in Port Elizabeth.

On 7 January 1988, Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) informed[119] Mr. P.H. Swart, Director: South African Agricultural Union (SAAU) that the forthcoming meeting of the Problem Animal Sub-committee was scheduled for 20 January 1988 in Port Elizabeth. The brief of the Sub-committee and the representation were briefly explained.

On 7 January 1988, Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) informed[120] Mr. S.J.J. van Rensburg, Chairman: Red Meat Producers' Organisation (RPO) that the forthcoming meeting of the Problem Animal Sub-committee was scheduled for 20 January 1988 in Port Elizabeth. The brief of the Sub-committee and the representation were briefly explained.

On 15 January 1988 Mr. G.P. Visagie, Nature Conservation Division of the TPA, explained[121] to Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) the Province's position regarding the poisons PDB 1 and 1080. He also referred to Mr. Botha's letter dated 7 January 1988 and the telephone conversation on 11 January 1988.

[118] File WK 40/1, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[119] File WK 40/1, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[120] File WK 40/1, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[121] File TN 8/5/5/1 Nature Conservation Division of the Transvaal Provincial Administration.

Version 5.0 – HO de Waal - Version 5.0

- The Division only became in a roundabout way aware about problems regarding the registration of PDB and have not been contacted by the suppliers of the poison collar. If such a request was received with the necessary information, its merit may be considered.
- The control of the poison "1080" fell under the jurisdiction of the Department of National Health. The Division cannot make any recommendation regarding its legalisation without the necessary experimental work being been conducted in this regard.
- The Transvaal Federal Problem Animal Control Association[122] was an organisation specialising in handling the control of problem animals for farmers. It received a subsidy from the Division and hunt clubs were encouraged to join the Association to be able to operate over a larger area. The organisation was based in Ermelo.

The NWGA's Problem Animal Sub-committee held a second meeting on 20 January 1988 at the SA Wool Board, Port Elizabeth[123]. It was attended by the Chairman Mr. P.F. Hugo (MP), Mr. B.P. Johnstone (NWGA), Mr. A.I. Odendaal (NWGA), Mr. A.P. Pretorius (NWGA), Dr. G.F. Barkhuizen (OFS Provincial Administration), Mr. G. du Plessis (RPO), Dr. P. Rowe-Rowe (Natal Parks Board), Mr. J.L. van der Walt (RPO), Mr. J.D. (Niel) van Wyk (CPA), Mr. T.F.J. Botha (NWGA) and Miss. C. van der Westhuizen (Secretary). Apology was accepted for Dr. P.F.S. Milder (TPA). The following translated excerpts from the minutes are cited:

- Mr. A.I. Odendaal opened with a prayer.
- The Chairman welcomed everybody and said the committee was given a wide mandate and the expectations of producers and the Minister are high. It should not try to find methods to exterminate all problem animals, but make recommendations on how to address the challenge in a coordinated way and apply effective control measures countrywide. He referred to the Coetzer Report on problem animals which was produced a decade earlier and said although valuable input was made, since very little progress have been made to address the problem and producers are losing millions of Rand per year. He trusted this committee would propose solutions that are more real.
- Mr. B.P. Johnstone requested that the wording ".. Transvaal Division of Nature Conservation do not want to cooperate with the other provinces" in the minutes be changed to read "..Transvaal Division of Nature Conservation believed that provinces must act independently." Approval of the Minutes of 8 December 1987 was moved by Mr. B.P. Johnstone and seconded by Mr. A.P. Pretorius.
- Mr. T.F.J. Botha said that all actions emanating from the previous meeting were completed. Additional material was presented to the meeting.
- The Chairman asked the representatives of the respective divisions of nature conservation to describe the measures taken by the provinces to control problem animals.
- <u>Hunting across provincial borders</u>
- Dr. G.F. Barkhuizen, representing the Free State said the provincial departments of nature conservation strive to cooperate. However, the ordinances do not allow private hunt organisations such as Oranjejag to cross provincial borders. He asked for greater cooperation between different hunt organisations and emphasised that the Free State will issue a permit in this regard to recognised hunt clubs from other provinces. During a hunt in the Free State, Oranjejag may enter any farm without requiring any prior permission.
- Mr. J.D. van Wyk emphasised that there is no objection if a recognised hunt organisation such as Oranjejag crosses the border during a hunt. If need be and a problem arises in this regard his office can be contacted.
- Dr. P. Rowe-Rowe confirmed that the Department of Nature Conservation in Natal held the same view regarding recognised hunt clubs. However, some individual farmers may object when the borders of their farms are crossed. Current legislation protects them.

[122] Federale Probleemdierbestrydingsvereniging (FPBV).
[123] File WK 40/1, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.

Version 5.0 - Hoede Nagel - Version 5.0

- After further discussion, the meeting realised that crossing of provincial borders will require amending of legislation; therefore, the matter must be taken up with the different authorities.
- Mr. A.P. Pretorius (NWGA, Natal) said he would discuss a possible amendment of the ordinance with the relevant authority in Natal. **Action**.
- Mr. J.D. van Wyk said a recent amendment in the Cape Province authorised nature conservation officials from other provinces to cross the provincial border and enforce nature conservation legislation – but it excluded hunt clubs/organisations.
- Current position in die different provinces
- Free State: Dr. G.F. Barkhuizen said only one third of the farmers in the Free State are members of Oranjejag. Since 1973, it was an organisation with voluntary membership. In addition to the compulsory membership fee, the province was also contributing generously to the finances of Oranjejag. It was still too little to employ more officials. In the cases where a problem animal was caught or killed on the farm of a person who was not a member of the organisation, such an owner was held responsible for the cost involved. In the case of a black-backed jackal, the amount was for example R150. In view of the limited work force, action was only reactive – in other words, hunts were only conducted on farms that complained about losses. Membership fees were about R70-00/1 000 ha. The Directorate Environment and Nature Conservation in the Free State was sympathetic towards the farmers and the policy was that no problem animals were allowed in the Nature Reserves. Responding to a question why more members were not registered with Oranjejag, Dr. Barkhuizen said it would create an untenable situation because all members experiencing losses would expect immediate attention to their farms, but due to limited work force, it would not be possible. It would only lead to great dissatisfaction.
- Cape: Mr. J.D. van Wyk said the view of the Cape authorities was that the control of problem animals was primarily the responsibility of the landowner. The province saw it as part of its duty to conduct research regarding control methods, training of the farming community to control problem animals and training of staff to control problem animals. The provincial authority subsidised hunt clubs through the divisional councils. With reference to the Coetzer Report on problem animals, he said a reason why the recommendations were not implemented was that it would have cost the Provincial government about R3 million and a further R3 to 4 million from the farmers, while the estimated damage caused was about R3 million per year. The province did not see it fit to hunt the three recognised groups of problem animals, namely caracal, black-backed jackal and vagrant dogs on the farms of landowners.
- Natal: Dr. P. Rowe-Rowe said nature conservation officials were based in the different regions of the province. They were trained to control problem animals and advise farmers. In the past the Province conducted research itself, but currently research was conducted in cooperation with the University of Natal. The Ordinance was frequently reviewed to ensure that it was not impeding producers. Nature conservation was however seen as the highest priority and the Division Nature Conservation were also advising the Provincial authorities in this regard. He also said that challenges were experienced regarding the lack of cooperation between farmers. Cattle farmers were in general less cooperative than small livestock farmers were.
- Transvaal: Mr. B.P. Johnstone said the view of the province was that there should not be interfered with nature. The hunt clubs received a subsidy from the Province, but primarily their member's fund clubs. Any seven producers with adjacent properties may apply to establish a club. There were two options – the club may request for compulsory membership of all the farmers in the hunt area to be served. Officials of the Division Nature Conservation would visit the farmers in the area and survey their view on the request. If 51% of the landowners are in favour of compulsory membership, it was implemented and the contribution proposed paid to the club. However, there were also registered clubs where landowners made their contributions voluntary. The clubs were all affiliated with the mother body, namely the

Versie 5.0 - Hoofdstuk - Version 5.0

Federal Problem Animal Control Association ("*FPBV, **F**ederale **P**robleemdier **B**estrydings**v**ereniging*"). If a farmer experienced problems with animals, he contacted his club and the *FPBV* to plan hunts. The latter was structured in different regions and they held their own meetings; members were nominated to serve on the Central Management of the Association. Policy was determined at the annual general meeting and could be attended by any club. Mr. Johnstone explained the difference in methodology between the Transvaal *FPBV* and Oranjejag. In the Transvaal, the problem animals were hunted systematically from a specific point and did not act only reactively when complaints were received. In the Free State, farmers who experienced problems were dealing directly with Oranjejag. In response to a question by the Chairman, Mr. Johnstone said the success factor in controlling problem animals in Transvaal was more than 80%. The contribution of a producer was R0.07/ha. He cautioned the meeting to refrain from making proposals that would disturb the balance in nature.

- After further discussion, the meeting agreed that a high percentage of membership was essential for implementing any scheme to make a substantial difference.
- <u>Extent of damage caused by problem animals</u>
- With reference to the study conducted by Dr. Lawson of the University of Natal, the losses in the province were estimated at 3% of the small livestock population. Of the total annual losses of R3 million, 43% were attributed to black-backed jackals, 31% to vagrant dogs, 11% to livestock theft (people), 9% to caracals and the remainder to other reasons. The survey that was conducted in Natal should be extended to the other provinces.
- Some members challenged the conclusions by Dr. Lawson. It was pointed out that several farmers could not ascertain whether a loss was attributed to a caracal, black-backed jackal or vagrant dog. It was also a relatively expensive survey and if it was to be extended to other provinces, the necessary funds must be sourced. The Wool Board has contributed to the project in Natal.
- Mr. G. du Plessis reminded the meeting that losses due to problem animals would have been much higher in the Free State had it not been for the good work of Oranjejag in controlling these animals.
- The Chairman said a survey which was conducted in 10 districts of the Cape and then extrapolated to the Province, suggested an annual loss of R45 million.
- The meeting reflected on the desirability to gather accurate information caused by problem animals and decided to request authorities or hunt organisations involved in controlling problem animals to provide the relevant information to the committee before 30 June 1988. Thereafter a decision can be taken on the extent and accuracy and the need for further surveys if need be to support the recommendations of the committee. **<u>Action</u>**.
- <u>The use of poison to control problem animals</u>
- This stimulated discussions and exposed differences of opinion. On the one side, the proponents of using poison 1080 referred to the good successes achieved. Strychnine is extremely successful in eliminating vagrant dogs. The poison 1080 is however prohibited by the Department of Health, while strychnine is also very difficult to obtain. In the Free State, the Ordinance prohibits anybody from lacing meat with strychnine as bait. The only exception is where it is used to control rodents. No veterinarian or pharmacy may sell strychnine unless the Division Nature Conservation has issued a permit. If indeed the strychnine is obtained, very strict provisions apply such as placing warning signs in three languages. Only people with the appropriate training can handle it. Although the Division Nature Conservation is not in principle opposing the correct use of poison 1080 it does not like it, especially in the wrong hands it creates a safety risk. It is odourless, colourless and cannot be detect post mortem.
- Poison ejectors. Because of sanctions, the devices are almost unobtainable.
- The meeting discussed the desirability of using poisons and a proposal to request the Minister of Health to rescind the prohibition of poisons and decided not to take the matter any further at that stage. The divisions of nature conservation in the different provinces would be

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

contacted to obtain their views on the use of these poisons. If there was an effective control measure available for problem animals, the committee reserves the option to include a recommendation in this regard. It was emphasised that only trained people should be allowed to handle these substances. Personnel of the divisional councils with the appropriate training were mentioned in this regard. However, the divisional councils were not yet accepted by organised agriculture as a whole.

- The meeting noted the research projects conducted by the Division Nature Conservation in the Cape Province to evaluate the efficacy of existing chemical and mechanical methods in controlling problem animals and requested that upon completion of the study the information be made available to the committee. The discussion was closed.

Action.

- Future planning
- The following decisions were taken:
- (1) Information must be collected on the damage caused annually by problem animals in the difference provinces. In the Cape Province, Mr. J.D. van Wyk was asked to provide the committee with the information. The information for Natal will be requested from Dr. Lawson. Dr. Barkhuizen was requested for the information in the Free State, because the nature conservation officials were in close contact with farmers. Mr. Jan van der Walt, through the game committee of SAAU, as well as other liaison that he may consider necessary, will provide detail regarding the extent of the problem in Transvaal to the committee. The relevance of distributing questionnaires to obtain information (rand value, problem animals, etc.) and the committee concluded that questionnaires are not very effective as means to gather information, but may be considered once the broad based information as detailed previously has been collected. Mr. T.F. Botha said that a circular note was distributed to 600 NWGA sub-branches countrywide requesting information regarding problem animals.
- (2) The Red Meat Producers' Organisation will be approached to request the Meat Board for funds (as was done by the Wool Board) to conduct more research as requested by the committee. Mr. J.L. van der Walt will test the waters via the RPO in this regard.
- (3) The Minister would be informed about progress and there should always be cooperation with the Division Nature Conservation. Inquiries should be addressed to all the nature conservation authorities regarding their views on future cooperation with the committee.
- (4) In principle it was accepted the farmers are primarily responsible to control problem animals and should keep the initiative, but the principle of privatising was supported and the establishment of hunt clubs encouraged where it was still absent.
- (5) Where necessary the different provincial ordinances should be amended to allow crossing of farm and provincial borders by recognised hunt clubs/associations to enable the control of problem animals in specific circumstances.
- (6) The RPO would be approached to assist with traveling expenses of persons without the necessary funds but deemed important to attend the next meeting of the committee.
- (7) To report to the forthcoming meeting of the NWGA's Central Executive regarding the committee's activities and provide guidelines about the planning and travel expenses for envisaged next meetings.
- (8) To Chairman must arrange the next meeting in consultation with the Manager: NWGA and invite well-known practical hunters of recognised hunt associations from all four provinces to attend the next meeting.
- (9) It was noted that the Nature Conservation Act was currently revised and would be tabled in 1989. Input must therefore be made to ensure that factors currently restricting control of problem animals across borders, as well as impeding cooperation between provinces. The continuous actions by all four provinces to ensure coordination of legislation were noted with appreciation.

Version 5.0 - No de Waal - Version 5.0

- The meeting adjourned with a motion of thank for the Chair and the Chairman's appreciation for the open and frank participation in discussions by all present.

On 4 February 1988 the Deputy Minister of Agriculture, His Honourable Dr. A.I. van Niekerk[124] acknowledged the NWGA's letter of 17 January 1988 regarding the damage caused by problem animals. He was aware of the problems experienced in this regard and appreciated the efforts to find solutions for the problem on a self-help basis. He also expressed appreciation for the work of the Sub-committee, chaired by a colleague, Mr. Piet Hugo and trusted that a practical and satisfactory solution will be found. He also acknowledged the commitment to be kept informed.

On 25 February 1988[125], the Secretary: Agter Pakhuis Farmers' Association (Clanwilliam district) informed Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) that their area experienced very few cases of livestock theft and predation.

In a letter dated 29 February 1988[126], Dr. David Lawson, Department of Zoology and Entomology, University of Natal, Pietermaritzburg said, "*I was struck by some of the comments made about the inability of the Wool Board*" to support the research made at a "*wool congress in Durban*." The main points of concern were, "*(1) If a grant is made to fund research in Natal then the other provinces will also demand an equal amount. (2) The Wool Board has already funded research in these areas and cannot support more*. "In response, Dr. David Lawson stated that other provinces would not demand equal money to duplicate the research. Although Natal has the smallest provincial flock, it has the greatest habitat diversity that makes it an ideal study area; ranging from montane habitats to sub-tropical coastal areas. The information will be applicable to farmers in other provinces, therefore granting to research aid in Natal will benefit the entire wool and sheep industry. With reference to the second point, if the Wool Board has indeed funded research into problem animals it begs the question why is there an increasing problem with these predators. According to Dr. Lawson, "*sheep farmers all over South Africa are expressing concern at their increasing stock losses and these can only be prevented by applied research such as mine. I understand that some research is being done in the Cape Province but if that is so why am I telephoned by farmers from the Karoo? If the research has been done it has certainly not been communicated to the farmers themselves. The Wool Board exists to promote and protect the wool industry in South Africa and support of my research is an excellent way of doing just that. With the generous support of the Natal Provincial Authority <u>and</u> Wool Board the research can and will result in real benefits to sheep farmers everywhere in the country. I therefore hope my request for funding is favourably received.*" Attached to the letter was a 4-page research project proposal to be conducted in Natal:

"***A study of predators on farmland***

<u>Researcher</u>: Dr D Lawson.
<u>Institution</u>: Department of Zoology, University of Natal, PO Box 375, Pietermaritzburg, 3200.
<u>Project supervision</u>: Dr D Melton will collaborate with the principle researcher and a small steering committee will be formed consisting of a representative of the Wool Board, the Directorate of Veterinary Services and the Natal Parks Board.
<u>Introduction</u>: A recent survey of the effects of predators on the sheep industry of Natal showed these effects to be very significant (Lawson, 1988[127]). Over two thirds of the

[124] File 3/37/4/12/1 - Ministersraad van die Volksraad, Ministerie van Landbou en Watervoorsiening.
[125] File WK 40/1, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[126] File WK 40/1, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[127] Lawson, D., 1988. A survey of the effects of predators on sheep farming in Natal. University of Natal, Department of Zoology and Entomology.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

farmers interviewed in the survey had a problem with predators attacking their sheep and 54.5% of those reporting problems said that their problem was increasing. The main predators responsible were dogs (Canis familiaris), jackal (Canis mesomelas) and caracal (Felis caracal[128]). Direct losses were estimated for the period July 1986-June 1987 at over R3 000 000 with indirect losses also being potentially high.

The results of this survey indicate a need for a research project to investigate the ecology of the predators responsible for stock losses. Acceptable control measures need to be developed specific to these predators to allow farmers to combat excessive stock losses.

Objectives:

1. To investigate the killing and feeding patterns of the different predators. The aim will be to produce a guide for use by farmers to aid in the correct identification of the culprit predator. Only after correct identification can specific control measures be implemented.

2. To evaluate lethal and non-lethal control of sheep predators. Investigations of scent and vocal communication of sheep predators may lead to the development of specific lures for these species. The design and use of electric fencing holds great promise for effectively deterring predators from sheep pastures.

3 To investigate the movement patterns, home ranges population density and reactions to different control measures of the different predators.

4 To investigate why certain farms have severe problems when immediately adjacent properties have no problems. Efforts will be directed towards isolating those factors of stock and habitat management that make areas more attractive to predators.

5. To investigate means of assessing the effects of predators on sheep in the future.

Keywords: Predators, natal, sheep, predation, control.

Literature: Similar problems have received great attention in the USA and Australia. Literature is available from both of these sources and contact has already been established with some workers in the stock protection field.

Study area: The Mooi River, Kamberg and Underberg districts in Natal. Additional areas will be considered as necessary.

Study area: 2 years.

Study procedure: This study will combine investigations of captive animals with studies of free-living animals. Captive animals will be used to investigate killing patterns and reactions to lures and control equipment

Radio tracking will be used to investigate the home range, movement patterns and population density of different predators in the wild. Radio tracking will also be useful in determining the predators' reaction to electric fencing if different designs.

Field testing of different methods of lethal and non-lethal control of predators will be a major aspect of the study. Good relations have been established with farmers in a number of areas and a number of different techniques are already under test.

Remote sensing techniques and multi-variate statistical analysis will be used to investigate the habitat factors that make some areas more suitable for predators.

The application of a report card as used in the USA for an ongoing assessment of the predator problem will be investigated. It seems probable that such a system could be added to other report cards used by organisations such as the BKB who have an ongoing system of sheep stock records.

Equipment and personnel: The incumbent will be a research fellow of the department of Zoology and Entomology at the University of Natal and as such will have access to laboratory facilities. Collaboration with the Allerton Veterinary laboratories considerably expands the expertise available for routine scientific investigations[129]. "

[128] *Caracal caracal*.

[129] Editor's Note: No specific amount was requested for the proposed project.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

In a letter dated 3 March 1988 to the Manager: NWGA, the Upper Cathcart Farmers' & Woolgrowers' Association (President Mr. B.R. Armstrong/Secretary Mrs. R.J. Currie) wrote[130]:

> "*Our Members were also extremely distressed to hear that the Nature Conservation Station at Adelaide is to be closed down. A number of farmers have had Dogs trained for their jackal packs, as well as hem giving invaluable assistance to the farmers. As many of the farms border on Forestry, problem animals are quite a problem.*
>
> *We do hope that you will prevent this service to the farmers being stopped but if it does close, is there any other place that could offer this same service?*"

In a letter dated 10 March 1988 to the Manager: NWGA[131], the Merweville Farmers' Association (near Leeu-Gamka, Cape Province) expressed their concern regarding some hunt clubs. The services of such clubs are not easily available, while other game (wildlife) is killed during hunts. Furthermore, farmers are compelled to make payments to the clubs but there is seldom a counter performance.

In a letter dated 21 March 1988[132], Mr. D.J. Visser, Director: NWGA/Wool Production, South African Wool Board acknowledged receipt of Dr. David Lawson's letter (dated 29 February 1988) requesting further financial assistance for predator research; the letter was copied to Mr. Theuns Botha: Manager NWGA. At a meeting on 15 March 1988, the SA Wool Board's Wool Production Committee *"…decided that priorities regarding predator research and financing be referred to the Predator Committee of the NWGA and to the SAAU Committee on predators. The purpose was to coordinate efforts in all four provinces and should further financing be considered, to obtain it from all sectors and parties involved as well*."

In a letter dated 23 March 1988[133] to Mr. Buys (General Secretary: NWGA), Dr. G. Oberholster responded to a request [Point of Discussion 31 - Poison Collars to be tabled at an NGWA Congress] for information on poison collars[134]:

- The poison known as 1080 was the salts of the chemical compound monofluoroacetate. It was the active ingredient of the poisonous plant (poison leaf, *Dichapetalum cymosum*) and known since 1876, but was only used since the 1940s.
- Characteristics: (i) water soluble; (ii) colourless, odourless and tasteless; (iii) acutely poisonous with an LD50 of less than 1 mg/kg; (iv) a delayed reaction (2-6 hours); (v) in dogs it caused convulsions leading to respiratory and circulatory paralysis; and (vi) I humans, monkeys, horses and rabbits, the decomposition product citric acid accumulated in the kidneys and heart.
- History:
- The use of 1080 was banned in the USA during the 1970s. Since controlled use was allowed again in some states.
- In the RSA, it was banned since 31 December 1981. The ban was initiated by experts from the nature conservation and agricultural sectors, but an act administered by the Departement of National Health and Population Development, namely the Act on Hazardous Substances, 1973 (Act 15 of 1973) was used to promulgate the ban.
- The reasons for the ban were: (1) Abuse, (2) Very dangerous for humans – poisoning was not specific and there was no antidote. Poisoning was practically untreatable, and (3) Safety situation.

[130] File WK 40/1, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[131] File WK 40/1, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[132] Ref 77/24 South African Wool Board.
[133] File 28/5/3/6 Departement of National Health and Population Development, Pretoria.
[134] See also letters dated 17 May 1988 and 27 February 1990.

Version 5.0 - HP de Waal - Version 5.0

- Recent developments: The Departement of National Health and Population Development took the initiative in developing a substitute. Experimental work was completed successfully and registration of a poison collar with a newly tested poison was expected soon.
- The substitute poison possessed the following advantages: (1) it was more effective and killed the problem animal quickly, *i.e.* within minutes; (2) Poisoning in humans can be diagnosed and an effective antidote was readily available.

In a letter on a letterhead of the National Woolgrowers' Association of S.A. dated 25 March 1988[135], Mr. D.J. Visser, Director: NWGA/Wool Production, informed Mr. P.F. Hugo (MP) about his correspondence with Dr. David Lawson regarding further financial assistance to conduct research on predation. In the past funds have been allocated for this research. He requested the NWGA's Problem Animal Sub-committee, which has countrywide representation, to consider the request and raise the topic at the SAAU's Problem Animal Committee. He emphasised the importance of determining priorities and indicate whether the problem is countrywide and if operational funds must be considered. According to Mr. Visser, it appeared that extermination and methods to exterminate was the biggest problem.

In a letter dated 8 April 1988[136], Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) reminded Mr. J.L. van der Walt (Manager: RPO) about a decision of the Problem Animal Sub-committee: the RPO should inquire with the Meat Board whether a request to fund research on problem animals would be considered favourably, if such a request was forthcoming. In past the Wool Board has funded research, but at a recent meeting decided to consider only requests that were recommended by the Problem animal Sub-committee. Furthermore, the RPO was requested to consider assisting persons who may not have funds available with their traveling expenses. The next meeting of the Problem Animal Sub-committee was scheduled for 2 May 1988 in Cape Town and some hunters who were invited may need financial assistance. He requested Mr. van der Walt to inquire with the Transvaal Hunt Organisation whether their chief hunter could attend the meeting. Mr. Botha would extend similar invitations to hunters in the Free State, Natal and Cape Provinces.

In a letter dated 8 April 1988[137], Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) informed Mr. A.P. Pretorius (NWGA, Natal) about the next meeting of the Problem Animal Sub-committee scheduled for 2 May 1988 at 17h00 in the Cape Sun Hotel, Cape Town. He was also reminded to inquire with the Natal Provincial Authority about its view for a possible amendment of the relevant ordinance to allow recognised hunt clubs of adjacent provinces in hot pursuit of problem animals to cross the Natal provincial border.

In a letter dated 8 April 1988[138], Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) informed Dr. G.F. Barkhuizen (Director: Environment and Nature Conservation, Free State) about the next meeting of the Problem Animal Sub-committee scheduled for 2 May 1988 at 17h00 in the Cape Sun Hotel, Cape Town. He was also reminded about the decision to invite practical hunters to the meeting to inform the committee on their views how best to handle problem animals. Dr. Barkhuizen could invite such a person from Oranjejag or alternatively provide the name and contact number of a person to Mr. Botha to extend the invitation. The letter was also copied to Mr. G. Nel, Chairman: Oranjejag.

[135] Ref 77/24 National Woolgrowers' Association of S.A.
[136] File WK 40/1, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[137] File WK 40/1, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[138] File WK 40/1, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

In a letter dated 8 April 1988[139], Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) reminded Dr. P. Rowe-Rowe (Natal Parks Board) about a decision taken at the meeting of 20 January 1988 that he would obtain a copy of Dr. Lawson's report from which he cited at the meeting. It would be appreciated if 10 copies of the report could be made available to the Sub-committee; he would be reimbursed for any expenses incurred in this regard.

In a letter dated 8 April 1988[140], Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) informed Mr. N. van Wyk (Assistant Director: Nature Conservation, Cape Province) about the next meeting of the Problem Animal Sub-committee which was scheduled for 2 May 1988 at 17h00 in the Cape Sun Hotel, Cape Town. He was also reminded about the request for the Division Nature Conservation's research report regarding the efficacy of current chemical and mechanical methods to control problem animals. Upon completion of the project, the NWGA's Problem Animal Sub-committee would appreciate a copy of the research results.

In separates letters dated 8 April 1988[141], Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) reminded Mr. N. van Wyk (Assistant Director: Nature Conservation, Cape Province), Dr. G.F. Barkhuizen (Director: Environment and Nature Conservation, Orange Free State), Dr. P. Rowe-Rowe (Natal Parks Board) and Mr. J.L. van der Walt (Manager: RPO) about the Problem Animal Sub-committee's decision to base its recommendations on actual information regarding predation losses (both numbers and monetary values). The committee was aware that many farmers control problem animals themselves and such statistics were not reported to authorities. However, any substantial information available in the respective provinces would be appreciated. Furthermore, the committee would appreciate the different Administration's view on the use of poisons to control problem animals ("vermin"). Was it viewed as a necessary aid and if so should it be more readily available?

In a letter dated 8 April 1988[142], Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) invited Mr. Peter Schneekluth to attend the next meeting of the Problem Animal Sub-committee which was scheduled for 2 May 1988 at 17h00 in the Cape Sun Hotel, Cape Town. Invitations were extended to other hunt organisations and the committee would appreciate the views of hunters how to handle problem animals.

1988 – Natal Province

The NWGA of Natal & Griqualand-East held a meeting on Problem Animals on 13 April 1988 in the Boardroom, Natal Agricultural Union in Pietermaritzburg[143]. The meeting was attended by Mr. A.P. Pretorius (Chairman), Mr. W.A. Human, Mr. S.M. Bester, Mr. K. Geldart, Mr. P.J. Naudé, Mr. T.J. Botha and Mr. T.F.J. Botha (Secretary). Translated excerpts of the minutes are cited:

- Mr. W.A. Human summarised the discussions at a meeting that morning with the NPA and Dr. Lawson. Present were among others Mr. Harvy Williams (NPA), Dr. Posthumus (Veterinary Services), Dr. Rowe-Rowe (Natal Parks Board), Dr. Lawson and a NWGA delegation. Dr. Lawson described how the R100 000 would be used to conduct research over two years on vermin. Problem animals will be trapped and fitted with radio transmitters to study their movement, specifically also outside parks. A large population of problem animal were present on farms, because prey was readily available. He was evaluating current methods to catch problem animals and would share the information with well-known private hunters. The

[139] File WK 40/1, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[140] File WK 40/1, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[141] File WK 40/1, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[142] File WK 40/1, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[143] File WK 40/1, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.

Version 5.0 - Hot de Wael - Version 5.0

recently established Problem Animal Sub-committee would ensure that overlapping research was not conducted.

- Mr. A.P. Pretorius said there was a need for such research. The Provincial Administration has made R50 000 provided producers will contribute a further R50 000.
- Mr. S.M. Bester said was possible to source money by first speaking to different service providers, such as BKB and Stock Farmers. However, some farmers in Griqualand-East were slightly antagonistic because they already contributed 42.5 c/ha towards problem animal control. Some more prosperous Natal farmers' associations may also be approached to contribute.
- The Chairman told Mr. T. Botha that a steering committee was established to evaluate the project regularly, comprising representatives of the Provincial Administration, Organised Agriculture (NWGA and RPO), Natal Parks Board and University of Natal.
- Mr. T. Botha expressed understanding for attitude of farmers in Griqualand-East and felt that farmers' associations should be approached for funds. He announced that Stock Farmers would donate R5 000 for the cause. It was accepted with appreciation.
- After discussions, it was decided that individual farmers would not be approached but organised agriculture would be consulted and farmers' associations must be approached. The Natal NWGA was also obliged to canvass support among the different farmers' associations. It was also not only sheep farmers who were affected, but cattle farmers as well. It was agreed to approach donors from the private sector[144]. **Action**.
- It was deliberated who should administer the funds. The meeting supported an offer by Mr. T. Botha's to approach Stock Farmers; the latter would be entitled to publicity during fundraising. If it were not feasible, a lady in Nottingham Way would be approached.
- It was decided to establish a committee as trustees and to assume responsibility for the application of funds, comprising representatives of the NWGA/RPO/Natal Agricultural Union and Stock Farmers. The committee nominated Mr. A.P. Pretorius and Mr. K. Geldart, and Mr. T. Botha would approach Stock Owners for their representative. **Action**.
- The Chairman would approach Mr. Steve Shone for a representative from Natal Agricultural Union; Mr. P.A. Lindsay may be considered because he was representing the wool seat and served in the small livestock committee. The contact detail of all farmers' associations in Natal and Griqualand-East would be obtained from Mr. S. Shone. **Action**.
- The Chairman would draft a short communiqué for Stock Farmers, which can be distributed to all the farmers' associations. **Action**.
- These letters would be distributed in the name of the Problem Animal Committee of Natal and not on a letterhead of the NWGA or Stock Farmers. **Action**.
- The communiqué would also be to all members of the Natal NWGA Management with the request to gather support for the matter from farmers' associations. It was decided to provide a copy of the minutes to these members of the Management. **Action**.
- Mr. P.J. Naudé would approach Smith Kline to contribute funds and similarly Mr. K. Geldart would approach Rumevite and Mr. S.M. Bester Logos-Agvet. The committee would decide later how to give recognition to the donors. **Action**.
- Mr. A.P. Pretorius was nominated as representative of Organised Agriculture on the Steering committee and Mr. S.M. Bester as alternate. **Action**.
- The meeting discussed the research envisaged by Dr. Lawson. Mr. K. Geldart said that, after a recent congress, he received a letter from Dr. Lawson with quotes on the prices of different aids to catch animals.
- The meeting decided the Chairman must approach Mr. Peter Miller personally and enquire whether the NPA was satisfied with the project of Dr. Lawson.

Action.

[144] Editor's Note: It is important to note the insistence in the minutes that actions must be taken on the decisions taken by the meeting.

Version 5.0 - 10 de Wet - Version 5.0

- It was decided to a write a letter to Dr. Lawson, with a copy to Prof. Melton, emphasising that there must not be any financial links between Dr. Lawson and private organisations while is conducting the research. He must also commit in writing that he will only engage in the research for two years and not act for personal gain. He must also keep the committee informed about activities on a regular basis. The Chairman will handle the matter.

Action.

In a letter dated 18 April 1988[145], Mr. A.P. Pretorius, Chairman: Problem Animal Committee - NWGA of Natal & East Griqualand, informed Mr. P. Miller, MEC: NPA about matters emanating from the meeting of 13 April 1988:

1. He thanked the MEC for the positive approach towards the serious problem and expressed appreciation for the contribution of R50 000 over 2 years for more research.
2. A special committee was established to source the necessary funds. Positive contributions have already been made, namely Stock Farmers who donated R5 000 and agreed to administrate the funds on behalf of the committee. Several farmers' associations have already committed to make substantial contributions.
3. Guarantees could not be provided but the utmost will be tried to reach the goal.
4. Attached was a letter explaining the situation to Dr. Lawson, as well as requesting him to provide clarity on his involvement with a private entity engaged in controlling problem animals.
5. Reference was made to the minutes of the Problem Animal Committee regarding his request that high level discussions are needed with the Natal Parks Board regarding the control measures they are going to implement in future, because it remained a sensitive issue with farmers. If possible, it was important to involve the MEC in the discussions.
6. He trusted the MEC would appreciate the establishment of a Steering Committee to oversee activities and ensure that overlapping with previous research was prevented; hopefully positive results in controlling problem animals would be forthcoming.
7. On behalf of agriculture, appreciation was extended to the MEC, with the expectation that an old and growing problem will soon be addressed.

In a letter dated 21 April 1988[146], Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) confirmed to Mr. T.F. Roux, Chief Inspector Oranjejag, arrangements for travelling and accommodation to attend the Problem Animal Sub-committee meeting on 2 May 1988 at the Cape Sun. The NWGA would cover the cost of the return flight to Cape Town, while Oranjejag would cover the cost of a night's accommodation at the Cape Sun.

In a letter dated 25 April 1988[147], Mr. N.G.A. Geldenhuis, Secretary: Klein Karoo Problem Hunt Club (based at Riversdale, Cape Province) responded to a memorandum issued earlier by Mr. P.F. Hugo (LP) and provided valuable information:

- The club was founded and registered in Wards 10 and 11 of the Langeberg Divisional Council. The geographical area of operations covered about 240 000 ha of 140 landowners. The area was characterised by mountains, valleys and hills; terrain which was difficult to access.
- Black-backed jackals, caracals, African wildcats, baboons, Verreaux's eagles ('witkruisarende') and honey badgers, caused damage to livestock.
- From 1 June 1986 to 31 May 1987, 84 black-backed jackals, 49 caracals and 41 African wildcats were killed. The successful methods were foothold traps - 131, shot – 18, young in dens – 23, hounds – 1, cage traps – 1, and poison ejectors - 0.

[145] File WK 40/1, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[146] File WK 40/1, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[147] File WK 40/1, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.

Version 5.0 - HO de Weal - Version 5.0

- From 1 June 1987 to 1 March 1988 (only 9 months), 51 black-backed jackals, 30 caracals and 50 African wildcats were killed. The successful methods were foothold traps - 103, shot – 3, young in dens – 18, hounds – 3, cage traps – 4 and poison ejectors - 0.
- If each killed only 15 sheep or goats per year at current livestock prices, farmers would have incurred additional losses of R261 000 per year. A loss of 15 head per year was ridiculous small. In 14 days, 26 angora goats were killed by 2 black-backed jackals on a neighbouring farm. Previously Mr. Geldenhuis lost 26 young sheep in a month. Honey badgers ate the lips and noses of animals and ripped the skins at the throat with their claws; the throats of such animals must be slit. Verreaux's eagles caught newborn kids, especially when does are kidding in the veld, but also in kraals at stock posts.
- Many farmers were trained to set poison ejectors. Initially there was some small success, but it became a total failure except for killing bat-eared foxes and mongooses. Cape Nature Conservation provided four trained personnel to hunt and conduct trial in different areas. They said black-backed jackals and caracals were abundant. They used all methods and set several hundred poison ejectors, but killed only bat-eared foxes, mongooses and a few Cape foxes; one caracal with a missing leg was caught in a cage trap. Apparently the lures used for poison ejectors and cage traps were not correct.
- Finances remained a big problem. The subsidy paid annually by Cape Nature Conservation to registered hunt clubs for a hunter and a pack of hounds was now very inadequate. The total subsidy did not even cover the expenses to feed the hounds.
- The success of the club was attributed for paying an incentive to members for every skin of a problem animal killed in the hunt club area.
- The hunt club received only R3 000 per year from the authorities, while the members contributed R5 000 annually year.
- The statement was often made that many black-backed jackals did not kill livestock. Black-backed jackals may live for months in the same camp with sheep without any killing and then suddenly they start predating, especially when they are whelping.

In a letter dated 25 April 1988[148], Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) invited Mr. Tony Tomkinson, Natal Wildlife Services, Greytown to attend the Problem Animal Sub-committee meeting on 2 May 1988 at the Cape Sun Hotel. Other hunt organisations would also be invited and the Committee would appreciate their views to handle problem animals.

In a letter dated 26 April 1988[149] addressed to Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA), Mr. N.A. Ferreira acknowledged receipt of the request by the Problem Animal Sub-committee to all provincial nature conservation authorities regarding predation losses; the deadline was "before 30 June 1988."

1988/89 – Orange Free State Province

Oranjejag requested the Administration on 31 March 1988 for payment of the annual subsidy for the period 1 April 1988 to 31 March 1989. On 3 May 1988, the Administration authorised payment of R422 180 to Oranjejag for the 1988/89 financial year[150].

As advised by the Director Nature and Environment Conservation, the Executive Committee of the PAO resolved[151] to rescind the previous tariffs (Executive Committee Resolution: 653/1988.10.18) and proclaim new tariffs which would be amended in the Constitution of Oranjejag from 1 April 1989. It reduced the large number of eight farm size categories and

[148] File WK 40/1, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[149] File N3/2/15 Provincial Secretary: Orange Free State Provincial Administration.
[150] File N12/7/4 - Payment form dated 3 May 1988 and Nature Conservation Memo dated 2 May 1988.
[151] Executive Committee Resolution No. 712/1988.11.15 – Orange Free State Provincial Administration.

Version 5.0 - W.O. de Waal - Version 5.0

tariffs to only three categories and tariffs, namely: properties up to 2 999 ha (R200/year), properties from 3 000 to 6 999 ha (R400/year), and properties from 7 000 ha and larger (R600/year).

In a letter dated 18 May 1988, Mr. C.D. Olivier Private Secretary of the Free State Administrator[152], acknowledged receipt of Mr. Theuns Botha's letter of 11 May 1988[153] regarding a possible amendment of the Ordinance; it was referred to the Provincial Secretary who would respond in due time.

1988 - National

In a 4-page pamphlet "*Peter's Probleemdierbeheer/Wildlife Damage Control, Inligting/Information No. 2*"[154], dated May 1988, Mr. Peter Schneekluth provided practical guidelines to control problem animals, the months of the year black-backed jackals and caracals are breeding and an order form to buy foothold traps and lures by mail. Black-backed jackals whelp annually during the period July to October. Caracals produce their kittens all year round but more during the period October to February. He said the control of black-backed jackals can be approach in three phases, firstly "*Try to catch them before they get moonstruck, mate and produce offspring about May and June*", secondly "*If you have failed in doing so, try to locate their dens with pups mainly during July, August and September*" and thirdly "*If nothing has worked, concentrate to catch the inexperienced youngsters who should start running around from September onward. They are easy game.*" For caracals, his advice was "*As far as lynx is concerned concentrate you're trapping efforts during the cold season, roughly from May to October. It appears that cold weather forces the lynx to keep moving. This increases his energy requirements and so he gets hungry. This in turn (as we all know) sharpens their hunting instincts. Because of this, the cats (and other predators) will react keenest to stimuli like baits, lures, eye appeal, sound attractors etc. This will result in better trapping performance.*"

The Problem Animal Sub-committee met on Monday 2 May 1988 (17h00) in the Franschhoek Hall at the Cape Sun Hotel, Cape Town[155]. The meeting was attended by Mr. P.F. Hugo (MP, Chairman), Mr. B.P. Johnstone (NWGA, Transvaal), Mr. A.I. Odendaal (NWGA, OFS), Mr. G. du Plessis (RPO), Mr. J.L. van der Walt (Manager: RPO), Mr. D.J. Visser (Director: NWGA/Wool Production), Mr. T.F.J. Botha (Secretary/NWGA) and <u>by invitation</u> Mr. N. van Wyk (Department of Nature Conservation, Cape Province), Dr. D. Lawson (University of Natal), Mr. A.J. Tomkinson (Private hunter[156]), Mr. P. Schneekluth (Private hunter) and Mr. T.F. Roux (Chief Inspector: Oranjejag). An apology was accepted for Mr. A.P. Pretorius (NWGA, Natal). Translated excerpts from the minutes are cited:

- Mr. G. du Plessis opened with a prayer.
- The Chairman welcomed all, especially the persons attending by invitation.
- After addressing a few corrections, the minutes were.
- Mr. B.P. Johnstone requested that the wording "relevant district" in the minutes be changed to read "relevant hunt area", "FPDP" must read "FPBV" and correction "the producer's <u>current</u> contribution amounts to 7c per ha." Approval of the Minutes of 20 January 1988 was moved by Mr. B.P. Johnstone and seconded by Mr. G. du Plessis.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

[152] Adm 21/5/4 Office of the Administrator, Orange Free State, Bloemfontein.
[153] File WK 40/2, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV. This letter to the Secretary: Free State Provincial Administration was also addressed to the Secretaries: Cape, Transvaal and Natal Provinces.
[154] File WK 40/1, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[155] File WK 40/1, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[156] Mr. A.J. Tomkinson, Natal Wildlife Services, Greytown, Natal.

- The Secretary informed the meeting that although Mr. P.F. Hugo (MP) stepped down from the NWGA, he was requested by the Central Executive to continue as Chairman of NWGA's Problem Animal Sub-committee. **Noted**.
- Ordinance amendments: crossing of the Natal provincial borders.
- Mr. B.P. Johnstone offered an apology for Mr. A.P. Pretorius; unavoidable circumstance prevented him from attending.
- Mr. T.F. Roux in the Free State the ordinance was protecting Oranjejag to enter any farm with or without the farmer's permission. Oranjejag did not have the same protection if for example it crosses the Natal provincial border in hot pursuit operation. Oranjejag was also not covered in Natal when the team of hounds would for example pull (activate) a poison ejector.
- Mr. N. van Wyk said he did not have the particulars but there was conversation of possible amendments of provincial legislation to allow crossing of provincial borders in specific circumstances.
- Mr. G. du Plessis alluded to the importance of the matter as well as the fact that in many cases hunt teams may not enter Nature Conservation areas.
- Mr. T. Tomkinson said that with the permission of a specific landowner, private hunters might hunt in different provinces or across borders. He said there was an apparent lack of coordination.
- Mr. D.J. Visser said the problems would not be solved unless there is an overarching national hunt organisation, which can operate in more than one province, or different hunt organisations in each province that can liaise with one another.
- After discussions, the committee expressed its view, namely that was desirable to cross provincial borders during hot pursuit operations. The Secretary was asked to write to all four provincial administrators and request them to include the matters of problem animal control and possible amending of the ordinances in the agenda for forthcoming meetings. **Action**.
- The meeting also decided to inform the provincial agricultural unions about the matter and request them to broach it with the provincial administrators when they deliberate at a next meeting. **Action**.
- The meeting also decided that the following members of the committee must give personal attention to the matter when liaising with the agricultural union and administrator. Transvaal – Mr. B.P. Johnstone, Natal – Mr. A.P. Pretorius, Free State – Mr. G. du Plessis and Cape – Mr. P.F. Hugo (MP). **Action**.
- Information on losses caused by problem animals – Provincial Administrations
- The Secretary reported that no feedback was received from the provinces in this regard yet, because the deadline was only 30 June 1988.
- Mr. J.L. van der Walt said the Transvaal did not have such information. They plan to conduct a survey in future. He wished the Problem Animal Sub-committee would meet sometime with the Coordinating Provincial Problem Animal Committee and maybe such information can then be obtained.
- The Secretary was asked to write a letter to Dr. P. Mulder, Director Nature Conservation of Transvaal requesting the information. After further discussion, it was decided to request similar information from all four provincial directors of nature conservation. **Action**.
- Positions of Provincial Nature Conservation on the use of poison
- Mr. P. Schneekluth asked for the judicious use of poison in controlling problem animals.
- Mr. T. Tomkinson concurred and said there should be control over the use of poison and it is desirable to allow only people who are trained and registered to use poison in controlling problem animals.
- Mr. T.F. Roux did not agree with the use of poison as such. He conceded that when the poison ejector is used correctly it could be effective. However, the problems encountered

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

by farmers in Natal with black-backed jackals, can be attributed to the injudicious use of the poison 1080.

- Dr. D. Lawson said the success of any control measure depends on the expertise of the operator.
- Mr. J. van der Walt said concerning Transvaal, people are also not opposed to the judicious use of poison – they think strychnine is one of the best poisons.
- Mr. T.F. Roux said the livestock protection collar (poison) was not very successful in the Free State.
- After discussions, the meeting expressed its view in favour of a judicious use of poison. However, the meeting did not support a request to legalise 1080. It was recommended that the poison ejector be made more readily available in Natal.
- The meeting accepted in principle that a range of different aids/methods was available to control problem animals and gave its support to all who plays in some way a role in controlling problem animals.
- <u>Evaluation of chemical and mechanical methods to combat problem animals – Cape Provincial Nature Conservation</u>
- Mr. N. van Wyk responded to a question by the Secretary and said the Division of Nature Conservation is currently evaluating all known aids and methods to control problem animals. As soon as the information is available, it would be provided to interested parties. It is envisaged the report would be completed by August.
- <u>Dr. Lawson's report on the research project which was completed</u>
- Dr. Lawson provided an overview that he has conducted in Natal and said the Natal Parks Board and farmers inquired about the extent of the problem in the province. A questionnaire was developed. The first part dealt with producer's perception of the problem and the extent of the damage caused by problem animals. A report produced in laymen's terms was available at R10.00/copy. He presented a slideshow.
- <u>Envisaged research</u>
- Dr. Lawson said the report was provided to the NPA and Mr. Visser of the Wool Board. He wanted to produce a photographic record to show how different problem animals were killing livestock. This would assist farmers in identifying the predator(s) that killed the livestock. He was collaborating with Mr. Tomkinson to evaluate American methods such as callers, night shoot, electric fences, etc. to control problem animals. He also wanted to the study the ecology of problem animals (how they acted during lambing, what would repel them, etc.). He wanted evaluate different lures to determine why it is only effective for some animals. His study was not aimed at evaluating current available methods, but also to determine whether there are deterrent methods that farmers can use. Problem animals would be fitted with radio transmitters to study their range areas and hunting methods.
- <u>Availability of funds</u>
- Dr. Lawson said he would receive R50 000 from the NPA over the next two years for research provided a similar amount could be raised by farmers. He has already started with the project.
- The meeting discussed Dr. Lawson's project. Several speakers pointed to the research, which have been conducted over many years in South Africa and abroad and felt it was high time that farmers experience visible results in addressing the problem. There was obviously a lack of coordination regarding research conducted and no single site where the research results were stored.
- Mr. N. van Wyk referred to the so-called Foundation for Nature Conservation Research of the CSIR and suggested they may be approached to coordinate research projects and disseminate information. There might be a cost involved.
- Both Messrs. J.L. van der Walt and D.J. Visser emphasised the need for a body to determine research priorities, monitor the research, report how the money was spent and who

Version 5.0 - H.O. de Waal - Version 5.0

accept responsibility before the Meat Board and Wool Board would allocate statutory funds for research.

- Mr. D.J. Visser said there must be differentiated between information that was available regarding control methods but not applied and information that was not available in which case research may be necessary.
- The meeting discussed the role of the committee in gathering information. There was consensus that it is the responsibility of the committee to gather the information.
- The Chairman inquired whether the Wool Board would allocate any more funds to Dr. Lawson's project and Mr. Visser said only if the Board was convinced the project was in the national interest because money of all wool farmers would be involved.
- Mr. P. Schneekluth said there was a great need for a reference manual describing in detail the hunting habits of problem animals.
- Mr. T. Tomkinson concurred and proposed that Dr. Lawson may possibly assist in coordinating the information.
- The meeting went into Committee (the invited persons left the meeting)
- After deliberating, it was decided to appoint a working committee consisting of Messrs. P.F. Hugo (MP), D.J. Visser, J.L. van der Walt and T. Botha. This working committee must gather information and make recommendations to the Sub-committee.
- The Chairman would determine the assignments of the working committee.
- The Chairman would also meet with the Minister of Environmental and Water Affairs regarding problem animal control.
- It was also decided to request the RPO for a contribution, not exceeding R5 000, to offset possible expenses regarding the committee's activities. Possible expenses might include traveling and accommodation of the Chairman when visiting problem areas to gather more information or, if need be, to cover the costs of persons who were invited specifically assist the committee and attend meetings.
- The meeting adjourned at 21h15 with a motion of thanks to the chair.

On 5 May 1988[157], the Rante Farmers' Association informed Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) that they supported the NGWA's initiative regarding predation and said pressure must be exerted on local governments to collect the membership fees of hunt clubs. They also suggested that a subsidy for predator proof farm boundaries should be explored.

In a letter dated 11 May 1988[158], Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) informed the Manager: Transvaal Agricultural Union[159] about the activities of the Problem Animal Sub-committee. Background information was provided on the reasons for establishing the committee, its composition, aims and activities and the progress to date. He alluded to the challenges posed by current ordinances, which did not allow crossing provincial borders in hot pursuit of problem animals. The TAU was requested to broach the serious challenges caused by problem animals when it was liaising with the Provincial Administration. The committee was planning to meet with all four Administrators in due course to discuss the possibility of establishing an overarching policy to control problem animals. The TAU was also requested to forward any matters regarding problem animals to the committee. The committee wanted to cooperate with all role players with a view to find solutions, which may result in the successful controlling of problem animals.

[157] File WK 40/1, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[158] File WK 40/1, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[159] Similar letters were also addressed to the Free State Agricultural Union, Natal Agricultural Union and the Northern, Western and Eastern Cape Agricultural Unions.

Version 5.0 - H.O. de Waal - Version 5.0

In a letter dated 11 May 1988[160], Mr. J.D. van Wyk referred to Mr. Theuns Botha's (Manager: NWGA) letter of 8 April 1988: the information requested by the Sub-committee was currently being collected and would hopefully be submitted before the end of June. Furthermore, the view of the Administration regarding the use of poison to control problem animals was very simple. Poisons have a role in controlling problem animals and were part of a range of aids available in this regard. It was also the unequivocal view that poisons should not be freely available but used only under very strict control.

In a letter dated 17 May 1988[161] to the Manager: RPO, the Department of Health gave feedback on the poison "1080". The request (S3/1/7 of 20 April 1988) was directed to the Department of Health and Social Services and then it was redirected to the Department of National Health and Population Development[162]. The paper trail showed this letter was received on 24 May 1988 by the SAAU and only on 22 August 1988 by the NWGA. The letter stated that progress have been made in developing a substitute for 1080 in poison collars and in accordance with Act 36 of 1947 (Fertilizers, Farm Feeds, Agricultural Remedies and Stock Remedies Act, 1947) registration was expected soon. Furthermore, unlike 1080, the substitute poison was more effective, death occurred sooner and an effective antidote was available.

In a letter dated 19 May 1988[163], the Private Secretary: Office of the Administrator, Province of the Cape of Good Hope, responded to a letter (File WK 40 of 11 May 1988; letters sent to all four Administrators) of Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA). On instruction of Mr. Gene Louw, the Administrator of the Cape Province, receipt of the letter was acknowledged. Furthermore, the matter resorted under the jurisdiction of Mr. D. Adams (MEC) and Chairman: Committee of MEC's responsible for Nature and Environment Conservation; therefore, the matter was redirected for attention.

In a letter dated 23 May 1988[164], Mr. T.D. Carstens, Secretary: Orange River Farmer Union wrote to Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) regarding the Problem Animal Sub-committee, its activities and the request for information on predation losses. Many problems were experienced with problem animals, especially in Boesmanland. He enquired if it was possible to nominate a representative on the committee, because such a member would contribute with practical experience from the region.

The NWGA of Natal & East Griqualand held a meeting on Problem Animals on 25 May 1988 in the Boardroom, Natal Agricultural Union in Pietermaritzburg[165]. The meeting was attended by Mr. A.P. Pretorius (Chairman), Mr. W.A. Human, Mr. S.M. Bester, Mr. K.R. Geldart and Mr. P.J. Naudé. Present per invitation (as observers) was Mr. A.C. Harvey-Williams (Division Law Administration, NPA) and Mr. S.H.M. Shone (Director: Natal Agricultural Union). Also present was Miss. M. Bolton (Secretary). Apologies were received for Messrs. T.J. Botha and T.F.J. Botha. Translated excerpts of the minutes are cited:

- The minutes of the previous meeting, held on 13 April 1988, was approved.
- The Chairman informed said the National Problem Animal Committee has met on 2 May 1988 in Cape Town. The meeting demanded coordination of problem animal research across the country. Messrs. Danie Visser and Jan van der Walt would collate information on

[160] File ANO/9/3 General Provincial Services Branch, Chief Directorate Nature and Environmental Conservation, Provincial Administration of the Cape of Good Hope.
[161] File 28/5/3/6 Departement of National Health and Population Development, Pretoria. Enquiries: Mr. R.A. du Plooy.
[162] See also letter dated 23 March 1988.
[163] File WK 40/1, Adm. 7/3. Administrator's Office.
[164] File WK 40/1, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[165] File WK 40/1, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.

Version 5.0 - HOLDS Wait Version 5.0

current research and report back in six weeks. The Chairman said the meeting must decide if the research by Dr. Lawson should continue in view of possible duplication. Mr. Peter Miller (MEC) was satisfied the project was in the interest of Natal and should continue. Stockowners has agreed to administrate the money collected in Natal at no cost and contributed R5 000 to the fund. Letters regarding the fund raising campaign were sent to farmers' associations.

- Mr. Harvey-Williams said Dr. Lawson's research was apparently aimed at practical control measures according to conditions in the respective affected areas. In response to a question regarding payment to Dr. Lawson, he said the latter was recently elected as a research associate at the University of Natal, which may possible result in a limited remuneration. The NPA also paid an amount to the Natal Parks board for research.
- Mr. Human said no funds should be collected from farmers' associations, unless there was certainty regarding any duplication of research. Furthermore, the circumstances surrounding Dr. Lawson's' relations with professional hunters in the Greytown are must be clarified.
- The meeting agreed that research was necessary in Natal, provided it was managed efficiently, was cost-effective and was not a duplication of other research.
- After more discussions, it was decided to decide on the continuation of the Natal research only after receiving the report on current research. In the meantime, the research activities would be kept at a minimum. The campaign to collect money should continue. If it was later decided not to continue with the project, all the donors would refunded. Farmers' association may opt to pay the contributions in instalments. **Action**.
- Mr. Harvey-Williams was authorised to convey the decisions of the meeting to the Advisory Committee of the NPA. He was also requested to activate the proposed steering committee as soon as possible.
- The Chairman thanked Mr. Harvey-Williams for his contribution at the meeting before the latter was excused.
- The Chairman said the NWGA Natal & East Griqualand Branch has little funds, therefore the Natal Agricultural Union agreed to pay travel and accommodation expenses for him, Mr. de Jager and Mr. Geldart from their Sheep Meat Industry Committee.
- The meeting dealt with some internal matters regarding the regional NWGA Congress and adjourned.

On 2 June 1988[166], Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) contacted Mr. Mike Hageman of Smith-Kline, Isando, regarding the possibility for a financial donation to conduct research on problem animals. The NPA announced they would contribute R50 000 for research on problem animals conducted by Dr. David Lawson, University of Natal provided the Natal farmers could contribute a similar amount. He alluded to the background for establishing the NWGA's Problem Animal Sub-committee, its activities and liaison with important role players in organised agriculture such as Stockowners. To set the ball rolling Stockowners already contributed R5 000, while several farmers' associations have also contributed generously. The importance of contributions by other private sector role players in the field of livestock such as Smith-Kline was emphasised. If Smith-Kline considered the request favourably, the money could be submitted to the contact person at Stockowners for the account of "*Problem Animal Research*."

In a letter dated 2 June 1988[167], Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) thanked Mr. T.D. Carstens, Secretary: Orange River Farmer Union on their willingness to nominate a representative on the committee. He alluded to recent meetings and activities of the Problem Animal Sub-committee; a small working committee was formed to gather information. The

[166] File WK 40/1, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[167] File WK 40/1, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.

Version 5.0 - Hoode Waal - Version 5.0

Chairman planned to visit and meet role players in different parts of the country and any input would be welcome. It would be appreciated if contact could be established with the person the Union intended to nominate on the committee, because he could be invited in future to attend meetings and share knowledge. The committee could also start liaising to keep him informed regarding the activities of the committee.

In a letter dated 2 June 1988[168], Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) wrote to Mr. D. Adam (MEC), Chairman of the Committee of MEC's responsible for Nature and Environment Conservation in the Cape Province. A letter send previously to the four provincial administrators (11 May 1988) was directed in the Cape Province by the Secretary of the Administrator to MEC: Adam. The Chairman of the Problem Animal Sub-committee, Mr. P.F. Hugo (MP) would like to meet with Mr. Adam and brief him on the background and the view of the committee regarding the request for an amendment of the ordinances.

In a letter dated 10 June 1988[169], Mr. P.F. Hugo, Chairman: Problem Animal Sub-committee wrote to Dr. T. Alant, Deputy Minister for Economic Affairs and Technology and referred to their telephone earlier that week regarding a drastic reduction of the import tax on the poison collar (*i.e*. Livestock Protection Collar). Dr. Alant was thanked for his willingness to investigate the matter and see if such a change was possible.

In a letter dated 10 June 1988[170], Stockowners Chief Accountant thanked the Secretary: Cedarville/Mvenyane Farmers' Association for the cheque of R50.00 as donation for the Problem Animal Research Fund.

In a letter dated 10 June 1988[171], Stockowners Chief Accountant thanked the Secretary: Camperdown Agricultural Society for the cheque of R50.00 as donation for the Problem Action Committee Fund.

In a letter dated 10 June 1988[172], Stockowners Chief Accountant thanked the Secretary: Weenen & District Farmers Association for the cheque of R200.00 as donation for the Problem Action Committee Fund.

On 16 June 1988[173], Mr. D. Adams (MEC) provided feedback regarding Mr. Theuns Botha's (Manager: NWGA & Secretary: Problem Animal Sub-committee) request dated 11 May 1988 (File WK 40). The Administration was sympathetic towards the problems stated in the letter, but possible amendments to the Ordinance on Problem Animal Control would have to be investigated in consultation with the other provinces. The Chief Directorate Nature and Environment Conservation was requested to include it on the agenda of the next meeting of the Provincial Conservation Committee, which will be attended by the four provincial Directors in order to advise the Administrator on the road ahead.

On 28 June 1988[174], Dr. G.F. Barkhuizen (Director: Environment and Nature Conservation, OFS Province) provided the following information on predation losses to Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA & Secretary: Problem Animal Sub-committee):

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

[168] File WK 40/1, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[169] File WK 40/1, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[170] File WK 40/1, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[171] File WK 40/1, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[172] File WK 40/1, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[173] File ANO/9/3 Executive Committee, Province of the Cape of Good Hope.
[174] File WK 40/1, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.

- He alluded to the difficulties in providing exact estimates of the small livestock losses due to damage-causing animals[175].
- A study was conducted to determine the extent of livestock losses for the period 1 April 1987 to 31 March 1988 and information was collected from 161 landowners, mostly small livestock farmers. These farmers were located in the Southwestern, Central, South and Northeastern Free State; only a few farmers in the Northwestern Free State were also included in the study.
- Of the 243 537 small livestock included in the study, 2 893 were killed by damage-causing animals; representing about 1.2% of the study flock. According to the Livestock and Meat Statistics of the Meat Board, about 6 835 000 sheep and 79 000 goats were in the Free State during March 1987. Assuming a loss of 1.2%, 82 968 sheep and goats were annually killed by damage-causing animals. At an average price of R100 per head, the annual predation losses incurred by farmers were about R8 296 800.
- The annual small livestock losses per landowner was broken down as shown in the table below[176]; 48.3% reported 5 or less head per year, while 2.8% lost more than 100 head per year.
- In a study in 1984 by Mr. N. Ferreira, Nature Conservationist of the Free State Provincial Administration, it was found that intensive problem areas were mainly confined to regions with larger hills and mountains. The current study showed that only 18.5% of predation losses occurred in regions where hills formed less than 10% of the farm areas. The remaining 81.5% of losses occurred on farms covered by more than 10% by hills. About 70% of the Free State comprises plains. Therefore, most predation losses (81.5%) occurred on only 30% of the Province. These findings should form an important part of the efforts to control damage-causing animals.
- It is the firm view of the Administration that the use of poison, for whatever reason, must be selective and only conducted under strict control. Permits were issued for this purpose provided evidence showed that no other method was effective.

On 28 June 1988[177], Dr. Barkhuizen (Director: Environment and Nature Conservation, OFS Province) provided feedback on Mr. Theuns Botha's (Manager: NWGA & Secretary: Problem Animal Sub-committee) request (dated 11 May 1988) on a possible amendment of the ordinances regarding crossing of provincial borders in hot pursuit of problem animals. Several principles were involved but the problem was not unbridgeable. In order to approach the matter in a sensible way, it would be discussed in September at the next meeting of the heads of nature conservation in the four provinces. He assured the committee that the interest of sheep farmers was given priority by the provincial nature conservation authority. The latter would like to keep close contact with the NWGA.

On 29 June 1988[178], Dr. T.G. (Theo) Alant, Deputy Minister of Economic Affairs and Technology, informed Mr. P.F. Hugo (MP) and Chairman: Problem Animal Sub-committee about progress regarding the request to reduce the import tax on poison collars. The matter was referred to the Council for Trade and Commerce; a Mr. Jeff Dyer was following up on a

Version 5.0 - NO de Waal - Version 5.0

[175] This report specifically used the term damage-causing animals (Afrikaans = "*skadelike diere*").
[176] Small livestock predation losses in the Free State Province: 1 April 1987 – 31 March 1988.

Number of head lost	Landowners (%)	Number of head lost	Landowners (%)
0	33.5	1-5	14.8
6-10	10.2	11-15	14.2
16-20	5.7	21-100	18.8
>100	2.8		

[177] File WK 40/1, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[178] File AMN 8/1 Ministry of Economis Affairs and Technology.

questionnaire and manual on policy and procedures regarding customs tariff protection and lowering of tariffs. Feedback will be provided in due course.

On 30 June 1988[179], Dr. P.F.S. Mulder (Office of the Provincial Secretary, Transvaal) informed Mr. Theuns Botha's (Manager: NWGA & Secretary: Problem Animal Sub-committee) about the quest (dated 11 May 1988). Amending the Transvaal Ordinance on Nature Conservation to allow crossing of provincial borders and activities of hunt organisations from other provinces was a matter that should be handled judiciously. Both the landowners and the Federal Problem Animal Control Association should be consulted and it must be decided whether this measure would apply in the case of Nature Reserves, National Parks and Forestry areas. Currently such areas are excluded from the activities of problem animal clubs. The request was also not clear about the extent of such activities and to what extent it was a problem at the Transvaal borders. Before the matter could be considered, it would be discussed with the Transvaal Agricultural Union and the Federal Problem Animal Control Association at the forthcoming Administrator's Conference. More information regarding the specific problem areas was requested from Mr. Botha.

In a detailed report to the NWGA of South Africa, dated 24 July 1988[180]), the Problem Animal Sub-committee alluded in a summary to its activities since inception (prior to 3 September 1987).

On 5 August 1988[181], Mr. R.T. Hardman (Provincial Secretary: NPA) wrote to Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) and referred to his previous letter (26 May 1988) in this regard. In all probability, it would not be possible to include Mr. Botha's proposals in the agenda for the forthcoming Administrators Conference. As alternative, he suggested to his colleagues a meeting between provincial representatives and Mr. Botha's association to discuss and resolve the issues to everyone's satisfaction.

On 19 August 1988[182], Mr. Theuns Botha's (Manager: NWGA & Secretary: Problem Animal Sub-committee) thanked Mr. R.T. Hardman (Provincial Secretary: NPA) for responding (Ref 12/3/1/1 of 5 August 1988) to the request for amending the provincial ordinance regarding crossing of provincial borders. The positive view was appreciated, therefore discussions with representatives of the different provinces was also welcomed. Any provisional dates and venues for such a meeting would be welcomed.

In a follow-up letter, dated 22 August 1988[183], Mr. J.D. (Niel) van Wyk apologised on behalf of the Provincial Secretary to Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) for not being able to provide the requested information by the end of June. The statistics[184] were for 1987 and obtained

[179] File TN 1/13/2/8 Transvaal Provincial Administration.
[180] File WK 40/1, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[181] File 12/3/1/1 Natal Provincial Administration.
[182] File WK 40/1, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[183] File ANO/9/3 General Provincial Services Branch, Chief Directorate Nature and Environmental Conservation, Provincial Administration of the Cape of Good Hope.
[184] Problem Animal Statistics for 1987: CPA Nature Conservation and hunt club.

Divisional Councils	Number of small livestock killed					Number of problem animals killed				
	Black-backed jackal	Caracal	Dogs	Other	Total	Black-backed jackal	Caracal	Dogs	Other	Total
Bredasdorp/Swellendam	8	597	24	26	655	2	51	25	52	130
Caledon	0	44	42	1	87	0	9	4	57	70
Calvinia	186	139	3	4	332	46	35	0	6	87
Cederberg	15	250	5	64	334	0	85	1	150	236
Dias	191	255	0	0	446	No statistics				0
Drakensberg	755	225	29	68	1077	No statistics				0
Gordonia				2	2	No statistics				0

Version 5.0 - HD de Waal - Version 5.0

from Divisional Councils and hunt clubs. The statistics did not provide a complete picture of the situation regarding problem animals and their effects on livestock farming in the Cape Province. Some of the records kept by Divisional Councils were also not complete or 100% reliable. The Chief Directorate did not have statistics on farmers who are conducting their own problem animal control; for example, it was known that the Koup Division was experiencing losses by problem animals, but no information was available. Unfortunately, no statistics were available on the costs incurred by hunt clubs to control problem animals.

On 2 September 1988[185], the Office of Provincial Secretary: NPA (Mr. R.T. Hardman) informed Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA & Secretary: Problem Animal Sub-committee) that no dates or venues could be offered yet, because comments were still awaited from the other provinces. Mr. Botha would be kept informed.

A Circular of the NWGA Natal & East Griqualand Branch (29 September 1988)[186], informed the Executive on the 1st Quarterly Report (1 January to 30 June 30 1988) of the Predator Control Research Programme (a 12-page document):

"*To: All Executive Members*

As your representative on the Committee monitoring the research project of Dr. Lawson, I am pleased to report as follows:

The project commenced on 1 January 1988. According to the information provided by Dr. Lawson it is my considered opinion that he is showing progress. Work submitted by him is attached for your perusal.

The Province is not prepared to provide any further funds over and above that made available during March before an equal payment is made by the sheep farmers.

Dr. Lawson is already overdrawn by more than R7 000 which will result in the project coming to a standstill at the end of September seeing that the farmers have to date only collected R14 000.

An appeal has been made to Agriculture to make the R14 000 available immediately in order to prevent the complete collapse of the project. You do realise that if farmers pay over the R14 000 at this stage there will only be funds for 2 months after the overdrawn amount has been redeemed, after which the project will once again come to a standstill. At present, funds are coming in slowly and it is doubtful if more than R17 000 will be collected.

Seeing that the project is starting to show results at this stage and it is being endeavoured to keep the project going as long as possible, I have suggested that R14 000 be paid provided the Province is prepared to pay the R30 000 budgeted for

Grootrivier	38	79	0	0	117	No statistics				0
Humansdorp	20	256	49	51	376	No statistics				0
Kaffraria	556	133	0	0	689	No statistics				0
Kareeberg	375	127	0	77	579	76	100	38	443	657
Klein Karoo-Langkloof	79	14	0	10	103	56	2	2	41	101
Langeberg	194	246	4	6	450	9	75	0	9	93
Matroosberg	24	12	23	11	70	7	3	27	44	81
Midland		2548			2548	No statistics				0
Namakwaland	813	56	13	6	888	230	27	15	252	524
Nuwe Roggeveld	300	14	0	59	373	50	7	0	256	313
Outeniqua	186	323	21	145	675	24	68	12	20	124
Prieska	No statistics				0	149	52			201
Smaldeel	75	580		48	703	No statistics				0
Stormberg		98			98	No statistics				0
Swartland	9	200	38	8	255	5	112	3	1	121
Vaalrivier	3				3	4				4
Witzenberg	24	156	56	48	284	1	24	4	25	54
Total	3851	6362	307	634	11144	659	650	131	1356	2796

[185] File 13/3/1/1 Natal Provincial Administration, Office of the Provincial Secretary (enquiries Mrs. L.C. Krog).
[186] File WK 40/1, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.

Version 5.0 - Hide Wmal - Version 5.0

1989. As counter-performance I undertook to once again make an urgent appeal to farmers to forward funds.

In closing I would like to mention that objections raised by some farmers were thoroughly investigated and I am convinced that there are no grounds for concern.

We trust that you will respond positively towards the project. Please contact me if you have any suggestions or queries.

Kind regards

A.P. Pretorius President"

An agenda was prepared for the NWGA's Problem Animal Sub-committee meeting, which was, scheduled for Monday 17 October 1988 @09h30 at the SA Wool Board, Port Elizabeth[187]. Several documents were attached to the agenda. However, it appeared this meeting might have been cancelled; therefore, the important progress already made by the Sub-committee was illustrated by listing the key points for discussion on the agenda:

- Amendment of ordinances – crossing of provincial borders: Requests were sent to the four provincial administrations to discuss the matter of problem animal control as well as possible amendments to ordinances regarding the crossing of provincial borders during hot pursuit operations.
- Liaison with Agricultural Unions: Letters were sent to all provincial agricultural unions, as well as members of the Sub-committee who has liaisons with the unions, to inform them about the actions which were taken.
- Information on losses caused by problem animals: Letters were sent to the four provincial administrations requesting information regarding the damage caused by problem animals. The response by the Cape and Free State Provinces were attached.
- Funding by RPO: The RPO was requested for a contribution, not exceeding R5 000, to offset possible expenses for traveling and accommodation of the committee's activities. The request was granted.
- Working Committee to collect information on research projects: Mr. D.J. Visser and Mr. J.L. van der Walt would present oral feedback regarding the activities to collect information regarding research already conducted on problem animals in South Africa.
- Summary of the Committee's activities: An interim report was attached, reflecting on the activities of the Committee until May.
- Report – Dr. D. Lawson: A report reflecting on the activities of Dr. Lawson (University of Natal) was attached.
- Planning for the future: The meeting should determine priorities on their envisaged activities, as well as draft a memorandum that can serve at the forthcoming series of discussions with the provincial administrations.
- Correspondence: (1) Use of poison 1080; (2) Import tax - poison collars; (3) Orange River Farmers' Union.

Under the heading "*Problem Animal Meeting*" to Mr. Theuns Botha[188], the following important information (translated verbatim version of typed notes, ostensibly recorded by his Secretary)[189] were conveyed:

- Piet Hugo phoned back at 15h00.
- He [Mr. Hugo] said the Heads of Nature Conservation must be invited and the purpose of the meeting was to draft a memorandum regarding a solution to solve the matter of problem animals in RSA.

[187] File WK 40/1, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV. Typist's date at bottom of the agenda1988.10.04.
[188] File WK 40/2, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[189] Editor's Note: Clarifying notes re dates, names were inserted in square brackets [].

Version 5.0 - Nico de Waal - Version 5.0

- He [Mr. Hugo] thought it was a very good idea to invite the Defence Force and said the Secretary of the Minister of Defence should be phoned to inquire where such a request must be directed. The Minister's telephone number was 012-266718. [Alongside, notes were pencilled in blue ink – Mr. Botha? - stating: *Commandant Botes*]
- We must first leave the Mines out.
- I [Secretary] told him [Mr. Hugo] the agenda would be posted on Monday [10 October 1988?].
- He [Mr. Hugo] was back to Touwsrivier– parliament was in recess. The following week he would attend some party congress but his wife would know his whereabouts. Phone her if need be.
- Then I [Secretary] looked for the telex/fax numbers of the different heads of provincial nature conservation. Then I made contact with Dr. Barkhuizen.
- He [Dr. Barkhuizen] said he would not be available at that date [17 October 1988] – he would be engaged with other commitments.
- He [Dr. Barkhuizen] would also not be in his office the next week, but only 11/10 [presumable 11 October 1988].
- He [Dr. Barkhuizen] said the problem animal matter was not discussed at the Administrator's Conference but it was recommended a meeting should be arranged between the Heads of Nature Conservation, the different MEC's and the NWGA. The Secretary of NPA was instructed to arrange the meeting and liaise with the NWGA.
- Dr. Barkhuizen said it would serve no purpose if the meeting was held on 17 October [1988] and we should wait for the other meeting, but recommended that you [Mr. Theuns Botha] contacted the Secretary of Natal and inquired about what exactly was the case.
- It was so late that I [Secretary] could not draft the letter but provide all the fax/telex numbers for possible use later.
- [contact particulars were provided:] Dr. Barkhuizen, TVL Provincial Administration Dr. P.F.S. Mulder, CP Administration J.D. van Wyk and NPA.
- [Several notes were pencilled in blue ink - presumably Mr. Botha. – in rescheduling the envisaged meeting of 17 October 1988].

In a letter (11 October 1988) to Mr. Piet Hugo (MP)[190], Dr. T.G. Alant (MP), Deputy Minister of Economic Affairs and Technology referred to his previous letter (29 June 1988), as well as Mr. Hugo's recent question in Parliament regarding the import tax on poison collars. Apparently, no response was received yet from Mr. Dyer. Mr. Hugo could contact him again to provide the relevant information as soon as possible to the Council for Trade and Commerce and ensured that the matter received the necessary attention.

On 13 October 1988, the NWGA received a letter[191] from S.L. Moorcroft & Sons Ltd, Syferpan, Queenstown. The Secretary of the Bongolo Hunt Club responded to the letter of 11 May 1988 and wrote, *"We would like to congratulate you on forming a committee to look into the vermin problem. We have a few serious problem areas which are serving to hinder the control of vermin."* The letter continued by listing the following aspects and requested it be brought to the attention of the Sub-committee: (1) National states or black spots within the Republic do not co-operate with farmers, hunt clubs, etc. even though their losses are enormous. (2) Game parks do not see the need to help. (3) Government, be it departmental, provincial or local level could be of more help. (4) The apathy shown by farmers themselves is a serious threat to efficient control.

[190] File AMN 8/1 Ministry of Economic Affairs and Technology.
[191] File WK 40/1, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

In a Circular[192] to all Executive Members of the NWGA Natal & East Griqualand Branch (14 October 1988), the General Secretary, Mr. Paul S. Buys, provided information regarding the fundraising for the Predator Control Research. At its recent meeting, it was decided to inquire which Farmers' Associations did not yet contributed to the Predator Research Fund. Attached was a list of 64 farmers' associations in the province and a list of 15 farmers' associations that have contributed (ranging from R50 to R3 000), as well a contribution of R5 000 by the National NWGA. On 4 October 1988, the total amount received was R15 950.

In a letter to Mr. Piet Hugo[193] (20 October 1988) and copied also to Mr. J. van der Walt (SAAU) and Mr. Theuns Botha (NWGA; received on 26 October 1988), Mr. D.J. Visser (Director: NWGA/Wool Production) provided a draft report regarding "*Research conducted on problem animals and research by the Department of Nature and Environment Conservation*." More information was forthcoming and would be available at the next meeting:

- 1 Introduction: Black-backed jackals and caracals seemed to be the sheep farmer's worst problem, while in some areas baboons also cause damage to small livestock flocks. The Department of Nature and Environment Conservation and other role players have conducted several research projects on this problem. Different control methods were tested and Nature Conservation and Environmental Affairs continue the work.
- 2 Research: The following research projects were completed: (i) Willem Ferguson – Black-backed jackals in the Eastern Transvaal; (ii) Chris Stuart - Caracals in the South-western Cape; (iii) Johan Bester – Cape foxes in the Free State; (iv) Lukas Stolz – Baboons in Transvaal; (v) Petrus van Rensburg – Bush pig in Transvaal; (vi) Dieter Worsbach – Control methods such as foothold traps and lures in South West Africa; and (vii) Dave Rowe-Rowe - Black-backed jackals in Natal.
- Nature Conservation and Environmental Affairs – Control of caracals, black-backed jackals and baboons with poison ejectors, foothold traps and cage traps at Robertson.
- Nature Conservation and Environmental Affairs – Poison ejectors and other methods in Transvaal.
- L.C. Moolman – Caracals – Bergkwagga Park and surrounding farms near Cradock, Cape Province.
- Dr. D. Lawson – Effect of problem animals on sheep farming in Natal.
- Apparently, the Department of Nature and Environmental Conservation had sufficient biological information on black-backed jackals and caracals. The information reflected on the behaviour of different animals, their habitats and the prey they hunt.
- An important finding was that when caracals were exterminated, black-backed jackal numbers increased. The opposite also applied. A link was broken in nature.
- Several research projects have already been conducted to control these animals. Methods such as cage traps, poison collars, poison ejectors and lures were developed. The success of these methods varied between areas. In South West Africa, lures were effective in attracting caracals, but in parts of the Cape, it did not produce the desired results. The problem seemed to be in the application of knowledge.
- 3 Extension: The Department of Nature and Environment Conservation was currently with an extension programme and training farmers to control problem animals themselves. The Department compiled and presented a training course for farmers. A copy of the training manual would soon be made available to the committee.
- Oranjejag is responsible in the Free State to eradicate the "vermin", but because of the vast areas involved, they cannot control the "vermin" effectively. In the other provinces farmers were responsible themselves which seemed to be more effective.

[192] File WK 40/1, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[193] File WK 40/1, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

- 4 Summary: It seems the difficulty was not funds for research, but spreading the extension message that farms must control the problem animals. A member of Nature Conservation once said, "*If you do not want to exterminate a black-backed jackal or caracal, you will not catch the black-backed jackal or caracal.*"

On 9 November 1988, Jean Geldenhuys (Secretary: RPO)[194] conveyed the RPO's Small Livestock Management sincere appreciation for the NGWA in tackling the issue of problem animal control. They confirmed continued support and expressed good wishes for the continued activities of the Problem Animal Sub-committee.

On 14 November 1988, the NWGA (Miss. Charlotte van der Westhuizen) informed Mr. Jan van der Walt, SAAU by fax[195] that the meeting of the Problem Animal Sub-committee was rescheduled for Tuesday 6 December 1988 at the SA Wool Board in Pretoria. The agenda provided previously to members was to be addressed.

On 14 November 1988, the NWGA (Miss. Charlotte van der Westhuizen) informed Mr. D.J. Visser by fax[196] that the meeting of the Problem Animal Sub-committee was rescheduled for Tuesday 6 December 1988 at the SA Wool Board in Pretoria. The agenda provided previously to members was to be addressed. If he could not attend the meeting, he could ask Mr. J.J. du Plessis to attend as substitute.

On 18 November 1988[197], Mr. D.J. Visser (Director: NGWA/Wool Production) provided a 20-page report to Messrs. Piet Hugo (Chairman: Problem Animal Sub-committee), Jan van der Walt (RPO) and Theuns Botha (NWGA) (with a copy to Mr. André Pretorius) in preparation for a Problem Animal Meeting which was scheduled for 6 December 1988:

- Supplementary to a previous shorter report on research projects which were conducted on vermin, more information was provided in 3 annexures:
- Annexure 1: Provided a list of research projects and publications under the following headings: Black-backed jackals or jackals [12], caracals [5], baboons [27], rock hyraxes [28], eagles and problem birds [4], leopards [8] and problem animal control [12].
- Annexure 2: Selected articles [15] regarding the social behaviour and control of black-backed jackals.
- Annexure 3: Tabulated list of envisaged problem animal research tasks, their status and priorities (Cape Chief Directorate Nature and Environmental Affairs).
- A project ("*The efficacy, selectivity and costs of current control methods in the Cape Province*") was near Robertson underway. The objectives are: (1) To evaluate methods under different conditions in the field to determine their efficacy, selectivity and costs; (2) To determine by way of comparison why control methods are not effective.
- The first part of the project, dealing with the control of caracal (cage traps and foothold traps) and baboons (cage traps), would be completed by the end of 1988. The second part of the project, dealing with the control of black-backed jackals (foothold traps and poison ejectors), would be completed at the beginning of 1990.
- The Cape Department of Nature and Environmental Affairs was also presenting a course on problem animal control. The copy was too thick to duplicate, but was available at his office for perusal.

[194] File S 3/1/7 Red Meat Producers' Organisation, Pretoria.
[195] File WK 40/1, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[196] File WK 40/1, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[197] File WK 40/2, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV [The letter and the info were only filed here and not earlier].

Version 5.0 - File de Vries - Version 5.0

On 18 November 1988[198], Mr. H.W. du Plessis, Secretary: Suurveld Problem Animal Control Club (near Humansdorp, Cape Province) wrote to Mr. Botha (Manager: NWGA). Since receiving the memorandum from Mr. Botha, another leopard was killed and they were again trying to obtain a permit. He provided the following important information:

- The club was founded in about 1925.
- Location: The club resorted in the Humansdorp Divisional Council and functioned in a part of the Kareedouw Soil Conservation Area. It was adjacent to the Cockscomb Nature Reserve to the north and the Formosa Nature Reserve to the west.
- Membership: Currently there were about 45 farmers in the area the club served.
- Hunter: The club had a full-time Black hunter and, when necessary called on the services of two part-time club hunters.
- Hunt results: The results recorded by the Club the past 10 years were listed[199].
- The Club also experienced problems from time to time with leopards, which caused huge livestock losses. Over the past 30 years, a leopard was killed during 1957, 1961, 1962, 1969, 1978 and 1987. Farms were bordering the Department of Forestry; because wildlife have been depleted on the public land, leopards were increasingly creating problems on private land. From April 1988 members experienced continuous problems with leopards. It was very difficult to obtain permits and a lot of time was wasted because often officials from the Department (Nature Conservation) were uncooperative. Recently a leopard was killed and another three leopards were currently killing livestock. A list with livestock losses[200] caused by leopards was attached.
- General: The terrain in the area was very difficult; therefore, the best way to hunt was on horseback with hounds. However, the same horse and hounds could only be used once a week for hunting. Therefore, two packs of hounds and horses must be kept which was very costly and beyond the Club's means. During the past year, leopards killed four hounds. Farmers in this area were all conservation oriented. However, the wildlife on farms bordering the Nature Reserves were also depleted and because few wildlife remained as natural prey, larger numbers of livestock were lost to leopards.
- Representations: (i) could the issuing of permits to hunt leopard be simplified? (ii) could the authorities attempt to reduce the number of leopards on public land? (Currently there was no conservation – only extermination of wildlife and livestock.) (iii) could the hideaways of leopards be restricted by controlled fires?
- Thank you for your attention.

[198] File WK 40/1, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.

[199] Suurveld Problem Animal Control Club – 10-year records

	Caracal	African wildcat		Caracal	African wildcat
1987	48	18	1982	15	3
1986	60	5	1981	35	6
1985	41	5	1980	20	4
1984	54	1	1979	39	4
1983	39	-	1978	54	4

[200] Livestock killed by leopards during a 6-month period

	Cattle	Sheep	Boer Goats	Angoras
Mr. G. du Plessis	-	78	-	-
Mr. M.P. Pretorius	3	92	-	35
Mr. J.S. du Plessis	-	43	-	-
Mr. J.G. du Plessis	-	35	-	-
Mr. W. du Plessis	-	49	-	-
Mr. H. du Plessis	-	-	35	27
Mr. J.P. du Plessis	-	27	-	-

Version 5.0 - Hoan Weal - Version 5.0

On 23 November 1988[201], Mrs. L. Dicks, Secretary: Dohne Farmer's and Woolgrowers' Association (Sutterheim, Cape Province) relayed an urgent "*Appeal for assistance in combating vermin*" to Mr. Botha (Manager: NWGA). At a recent meeting, the appeal for assistance was supported by the association. Mr. Len Scrooby wrote:

> *"The Quanti and Bolo and neighbouring farmers are, in spite of the frequent kills by their two Jackal Packs, fighting a losing battle in their efforts to combat the heavy loss of sheep being incurred, as a result of the ever increasing population of the Black Backed Jackal and Lynx, in the area.*
>
> *An urgent appeal is hereby made by these Wool Growers, through Organized Agriculture, to the N.W.G.A. for financial and technical assistance with the control of these predators.*
>
> *The situation has resulted in farmers reducing the size of their flocks in favour of cattle, and in some cases, farmers have been forced to abandon sheep farming entirely."*

On 30 November 1988[202], Mr. A.G. Purchase (Manager: Commodities) also brought the plight of wool farmers in the Sutterheim district to the attention of the NGWA. He stated, "*I presume that this matter may be taken up by the N.W.G.A. alone or be referred to the South African Agricultural Union's Problem Animal Control Committee with which you co-operate. Please inform me of the steps taken and possible outcome or inform the Dohne Farmers' and Woolgrowers' Association directly and furnish me with a copy of the reply."*

On 6 December 1988,[203] the Problem Animal Sub-committee's Working Group[204] met at the Wool Board, Pretoria. Four members attended the meeting: Mr. P.F. Hugo (MP, Chairman), Mr. D.J. Visser (Wool Board), Mr. J.L. van der Walt (RPO) and Mr. T.F.J. Botha (NWGA/Secretary). Excerpts from the minutes are cited:

- Mr. P.F. Hugo welcomed all present. He said the committee must still do some work and would not be able to produce a report by the end of the year. The committee must investigate the economic consequences of problem animals on the small livestock industry, the implications of problem animals on nature conservation, the reasons why problem animal control methods did not succeed as expected and to make recommendations that can change the current negative position.
- A previous report advanced the following reasons why control methods were disappointing: (i) poorly designed foothold traps, (ii) poor setting techniques, (iii) ineffective poisons, (iv) lack of knowledge how to use poison, (v) unrealistic legislation regarding the use of poison, (vi) disappointing results with poison ejectors, cage traps and hunt hounds, (vii) depopulation of rural areas – deserted farms, (viii) deterioration of jackal-proof fences, (ix) conservation and forestry areas bordering farms, (x) self-governing black territories, (xi) poor cooperation among farmers, (xii) poor knowledge of the training which is available, and (xiii) shortage of professional hunters.
- The Chairman continued reading excerpts from an old report; he emphasised the importance of farmers controlling problem animals themselves and that should take the initiative in this regard.
- Minutes: On a point of order, Mr. Visser said the minutes of the meeting that was held on 2 May 1988 could not be approved because this was only a meeting of the Working Group (or working committee). **Noted**.
- Possible amending of Ordinances - crossing of provincial borders: A request must be made to deliberate with representatives of all four provinces on 15, 16, 17 March in Durban. **Action**.

[201] File WK 40/1, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[202] File L 6/12/10/24; L 3/3/8; 9/2. East Cape Agricultural Union, Queenstown.
[203] File WK 40/2, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[204] The Minutes of 2 May 1998 referred to this Working Group as a Working Committee.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

- Liaison with Agricultural Unions: Letters were written to all provincial agricultural unions informing them on the objective of the Problem Animal Sub-committee. **Noted**.
- Information regarding damage caused by problem animals: Mr. D.J. Visser said that sheep numbers are available for the different provinces. If the numbers provided by the Free State were projected to the other provinces, some reliable estimates may be derived. The losses estimated for the Cape Province were R32 million per year, R14 million for the Free State, R6 million for Transvaal and R2 million for Natal. The total annual loss for the country was estimated at R54 million. **Noted**.
- Funding from RPO: The contribution of R5 000 by the RPO towards the T&S costs of the committee's activities were noted with thanks. The Chairman asked the Secretary to send a letter of thanks for the gesture to the RPO. **Action**.
- Working Committee - to gain information regarding research: The report provided by Mr. Visser was considered and the meeting reached the following conclusions: (i) very extensive research has been conducted on the behaviour, conduct and hunting methods of problem animals, (ii) however, the available information was not effectively applied and transferred, (iii) it seems the control methods needed adaptation to changing circumstances – research on control methods was underway and because it was a dynamic subject, it may be desirable to continue the work, (iv) the same applied at official level to extension officers of the Department of Agriculture and Nature Conservation, and (v) the media.

Regarding control methods, persons applying the control methods themselves must be brought together to distribute the information. It should be considered to produce a publication, easily understandable by ordinary farmers, how to identify and control problem animals.

It was suggested that specific persons in the respective Divisional Councils be made responsible to collect information on problem animals and acted as coordinator between the researcher and farmers. The salaries should be financed from levies.

There should be legislation to ensure effective fences preventing problem animals escaping to farms from nature reserves, military or other semi-government areas. If such fences were not effective, these institutions must be held responsible for damage caused by the animals that escaped from these properties.

Mr. J.L. van der Walt **proposed** that the drafting of a manual on problem animals by specialists be put on the agenda for the envisaged discussions with provincial authorities. The manual should be available to Divisional Councils, farmers; associations and individual farmers.

Mr. D.J. Visser **agreed with** the proposal and said sufficient information should already be available to draft such a manual. However, at the meeting it should be decided who would be responsible to compile the document. **Action**.

- Summary of the Sub-committee's activities: The meeting noted an interim report of the Sub-committee's activities that was drafted in July 1988. **Noted**.
- Report Dr. Lawson: A report by Dr. Lawson was noted. The Secretary informed the meeting that Dr. Lawson resigned at the University of Natal to assume a post in Uganda. **Noted**.
- Future planning: the following were decided: (i) to engage urgently with provincial representatives and discuss matters which impeded effective control methods, (ii) add hot pursuit activities across provincial borders to the agenda for discussion, (iii) consider at that meeting the role of divisional councils in coordinating information on problem animals, (iv) regarding research the working group noted the work that have already been conducted, (v) the committee also noted the control methods which were available and which were used successfully in certain provinces. The control methods was a dynamic subject, therefore it was recommended that development in this regard should be continued, (vi) the working group noted the training courses presented by private and official entities. However, it was recommended that a training manual be compiled to serve as guideline for all entities when presenting training on problem animals, (vii) it was recommended that the proposed training

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

manual be discussed at the envisaged meeting with provincial representatives and also decide who should take the lead in compiling the training manual at their cost, (viii) the meeting suggested that provincial authorities may continue with research if the wish, but at that stage the industries would not make any contributions, (ix) the Problem Animal Sub-committee would only meet again after the envisaged meeting and discussions in March, (x) the report by Mr. D.J. Visser on research projects should be made available for the meeting and discussions in March, (xi) the matter of provincial conservation areas adjacent to farming areas and the resulting problems must be discussed with the relevant authorities as the first priority and, as a second priority, tackle the problem of state corporations, for example ISCOR, Defence Force and private entities at a later stage, (xii) the legislation in this regard must be considered and determined who should be held responsible for losses incurred by farmers when problem animals are breeding in nature conservation areas, and (xiii) discussions with the representatives of the independent and TBVC states should be added to the agenda of the following meeting. **Action**.

- Correspondence: the Secretary handled letters answered and to be answered. **Action**.
- Use of poison 1080: **Noted**.
- Import tax – poison collars: **Noted**.
- Orange River Farmers' Union: The request to nominate a representative of the Union on the committee was not granted at that stage. **Action**.
- The meeting adjourned with a motion of thanks at 13h30.

1989/90 – Orange Free State Province

On 15 March 1989, Oranjejag requested the Administration for payment of the annual subsidy for the period 1 April 1989 to 31 March 1990. On 9 May 1989 the Administration paid R464 000 as subsidy to Oranjejag for the 1989/90 financial year[205].

Statistics regarding problem animal control were listed in Oranjejag's 1990 Annual Report[206] by the Chairman.

1989 – Natal Province

In a letter dated 23 May 1989[207], Mr. Paul S. Buys (General Secretary: NWGA Natal & East Griqualand Branch) informed the Secretary: National Problem Animal Sub-committee (Mr. Theuns Botha), of an important decision taken at the 60th Annual congress. As recorded (Minutes, page 20, point of discussion 18), it was decided to request the National Problem Animal Sub-committee to investigate the use of poison to control problem animals.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

[205] File N12/7/4 - Payment advice dated 7 May 1990 and Oranjejag letter dated 15 March 1989.

[206] Oranjejag 1990 Annual Report - Problem Animal Statistics per region in the Orange Free State Province

	Caracal		Black-backed jackal		Cape fox		African wildcat		Vagrant dogs	
Region	Hounds	Cages	Hounds	Getters	Hounds	Getters	Hounds	Cages	Getters	Total
Bloemfontein	134	34	208	103	96	368	106	2	15	1066
Boshof	32	3	185	270	56	372	28		19	965
Ventersburg	13	3	81	464	18	732	15		81	1407
Warden	2	41	230	92	202	518	22	5	76	1188
Total	181	81	704	929	372	1990	171	7	191	4626

[207] File NGO/7.3 Mr. Paul S. Buys, General Secretary.

A survey that commenced on 1 July 1987 in Natal concluded that predators had significant effects on the sheep industry of the Province[208]. According to the majority of the survey's respondents, the predation problem increased. Furthermore "*direct losses of stock are conservative and estimated at over R3 000 000 with indirect losses also being potentially high.*" It was further concluded, "*Although many farmers use control measures to alleviate stock losses these methods are largely ineffective. Kraaling of sheep causes other problems with the flock and is not suitable for use with large flocks. Hunt clubs are effective where there is a skilled huntsman and committed members but there are often problems with the organisation of these clubs that result in farmers preferring to use other methods. Other methods are used erratically and with little success under present methods of application.*"

The report cited an excerpt from a 1912 issue of the Farmer's Weekly magazine:

> "*Some years ago farmers residing under the spurs of the Drakensberg, near the sources of the big and little Mooi Rivers, were so pestered by incursions of jackals amongst their sheep that many of them had to part with the remnants of their flocks before they became completely wiped out. Many spasmodic hunts were held from time to time, and with varying success, but no sooner had the jackals realized that all was quiet again, then down they came and once more a picture of slaughter met the eyes of the unfortunate sheep farmer, when next morning he rode through his paddock to inspect his stock…. It seems a great pity that in a country where so much money is spent in safeguarding animals against attacks from disease and insect parasites, nothing is done to protect them against these larger and yet quite as deadly foes.*"

1989 - National

On 1 January 1989[209], Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) thanked Mr. J.L. van der Walt (Manager: RPO) on behalf of the Problem Animal Sub-committee and the NWGA for the RPO's contribution of R5 000 towards the Sustenance & Travel costs of the committee. It would certainly assist the committee in continuing its activities and be successful in achieving results. Another important goal was also to reach final decisions during that year.

In a letter dated 19 January 1989[210] to the Secretary: NPA (Mr. R.T. Hardman), Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) gave background on the request for a meeting between the National Problem Animal Sub-committee and the Provincial MEC's. The letter alluded to several important aspects:

- With reference to the Secretary's previous letter (12/3/1/1 of 5 August 1988) and the response by the Problem Animal Sub-committee (19 August 1988), it was decided to request an urgent meeting between relevant parties and to provide some background on the committee.
- The Problem Animal Sub-committee of the NWGA, chaired by Mr. P.F. Hugo, was formed in July 1988. This was justified by the following: (1) the apparent lack of coordination in the different provinces to control problem animals. Each province followed their own approach in this regard. (2) Points for discussions regarding problem animals appeared every year at congresses but apparently, not much progress was made to solve the matter. (3) The extent of the problem and the resulting financial losses incurred by losses were increasing.
- The Red Meat Producers' Organisation also discussed the problem, therefore it was agreed to cooperate representatives of the RPO on this committee. Messrs. Jan van der Walt (SAAU) and G. du Plessis was nominated as RPO representatives.

[208] Lawson, D., 1988. A survey of the effects of predators on sheep farming in Natal. University of Natal, Department of Zoology and Entomology.
[209] File WK 40/2, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[210] File WK 40/2, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

- Since, several meetings were held to which representatives of the different provincial divisions of nature conservation were invited.
- In the meantime, a working committee was formed to evaluate information that was already available. A list of topics for discussion at the envisaged meeting was compiled, namely: (1) The problem as perceived by the producer, (2) Dealing with the memorandum as drafted by the Problem Animal Sub-committee, (3) Viewpoint of provincial authorities regarding problem animal control, (4) Amending ordinances (to legalise hunting across provincial borders), (5) Research projects already conducted, (6) Compiling a manual by experts for use by farmers, and (7) Coordinator: Divisional Councils.
- Depending on circumstances, this proposed agenda may be changed.
- The committee proposed 15, 16, 17 March in Durban as possible venue. Proposing other dates or venue would be welcomed. Feedback would be appreciated to make final arrangements.

In a letter dated 27 January 1989[211], the Secretary: NPA acknowledged receipt of Mr. Theuns Botha's (Manager: NWGA) letter of 19 January 1989 regarding a meeting between the National Problem Animal Sub-committee and the Provincial MEC's. The matter would be investigated and a response provided in due course.

In a letter dated 16 June 1989[212] to Mr. P. Miller, MEC: NPA [with copies of the letter to Messrs. J.L. van der Walt (RPO), P.F. Hugo, D.J. Visser & P.E. Kingwill], Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA & Secretary: National Problem Animal Sub-committee, conveyed the Sub-committee's displeasure regarding the poor progress with the request to meet with members of the executive committees of the provinces. Attached to the letter was a number of previous correspondence alluding to presentations requesting a meeting. The unsatisfactory situation suggested it would in all probability not be possible to find a common date for a meeting in the next month. The RPO's Sheep Committee discussed the matter the previous day in Durban and they expressed their displeasure with the apparent lack of progress. Mr. Miller was kindly requested to liaise with his colleagues in the other provinces and arrange such a meeting not later than the end of July. The NWGA, with the aid of the RPO, was even prepared to pay the T&S costs of persons involved if finances were impeding factors to meet. Furthermore, Mr. Miller informed his secretary by telephone that the relevant official in Transvaal has resigned and the designated official in the Free State was on sick leave. The Sub-committee was prepared to meet with their alternates or where applicable successors with a view to make headway with its activities. The meeting could convene wherever it was convenient. It would be appreciated if Mr. Miller could make contact as soon as possible with a view to agree on a suitable date.

In a letter dated 30 June 1989[213], Mr. P. Miller, MEC: NPA responded to Mr. Theuns Botha's (Manager: NWGA & Secretary: National Problem Animal Sub-committee[214]) letter of 16 June 1989 regarding lack of progress to arrange a meeting between the Sub-committee and provincial MEC's. He offered some explanations:

- Efforts to arrange the meeting were impeded by among others, the following: (1) Mr. Fanie Schoeman, the MEC: Transvaal retired on 1 April and his successor would only be assuming duties late in May. (2) The poor health of Mr. Simes of the Free State resulted in his retirement on 30 June. His successor has not yet been appointed.

[211] File 12/3/1/1 Natal Provincial administration. Enquiries: Mrs. P. Hall.
[212] File WK 40/2, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[213] File WK 40/2, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[214] File WK 40/2, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV – Handwitten note (dated 10/7/89), stated the information was circulated to P.F. Hugo, D. Visser, J. v/d Walt and P.E. Kingwill.

Version 5.0 – HO de Waal - Version 5.0

- These two gentlemen were responsible for problem animals in their respective provinces and without them present, a meeting would have been futile.
- To worsen the problem the provinces are now moving in an election campaign for MEC's which will tie them down until 6 September. It would therefore not be possible to consider the request favourably and meet before the end of July. In fact, such a meeting cannot be convened until after the meeting. He assured Mr. Botha that expenses had nothing to do with the fact that the meeting could not be arranged yet.
- It was suggested that his office was contacted again after the election to make the necessary arrangements for a meeting.

In a letter dated 5 August 1989[215], Mr. F.J.C. van Rooyen (Secretary: Rouxville District Farmers' Union) informed Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) about an important matter. At a general meeting of the Union, the issue of vagrant dogs was raised once again. It was worrying that the problem was increasing. In their area, the problem was exacerbated by workers staying at livestock posts and then allowed by landowners to keep unlimited numbers of dogs. These dogs were wandering around without supervision and cause tremendous damage that cannot be compensated for by the owner of the dogs. Another problem was the vagrant dogs of both black and white inhabitants in and around towns. This was causing tremendous problems for farmers adjacent to these areas. The Union called on the committee to address the matter and escalate it higher to the Free State NGWA. They thanked the committee for their work and trusted the issue of vagrant dogs would further bolster efforts, because the committee was already attending to a very serious problem affecting livestock farmers.

In a letter dated 14 August 1989[216], Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) replied to Mr. F.J.C. van Rooyen's (Secretary: Rouxville District Farmers' Union) letter (5 August 1989); the letter was copied to Mr. P.F. Hugo (Chairman Problem Animal Sub-committee). Mr. Botha briefly elaborated on the need to form the NWGA's Problem Animal Sub-committee, representation from the four provincial NGWA branches and its activities, investigating issues and discussing it with different authorities. The issue broached by the Union would be conveyed to the committee. He assured the Union of the NGWA's shared concern and said that every effort will be made to find a solution.

In a letter dated 30 August 1989[217], Mr. P.F. Hugo (Chairman Breërivier RSC) provided important information regarding the registration of the poison collar to Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA). Copies of this very important letter were also submitted to: (1) Mr. T. Botha, NGWA of SA, Port Elizabeth; (2) Mr. G.J. Kotze, Minister of Environmental Affairs, Cape Town; (3) Dr. A.I. van Niekerk, Deputy Minister of Agriculture, Cape Town; (4) the Deputy Minister of Economic Affairs and Technology, Pretoria; and (5) the Director Nature and Environmental Affairs, Cape Town. Excerpts from the letter are cited:

- It was a pleasure to state that the Poison Collar was registered in compliance with Act 36, 1947, with the Registration Number L4097.
- In cooperation with the Department of Health, the previous Matroosberg Divisional Council conducted the necessary trials to ensure the inclusion of poison P.D.B.1 with the registration.
- To his knowledge, the poison collar was the only selective control method available to kill only the problem animal that were causing the damage.

[215] File WK 40/2, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[216] File WK 40/2, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[217] File 18/8/3 Breërivier Regional Services Council, Trappes Street, Cape Province, Worcester, 6850.

Version 5.0 - H.O. de Waal - Version 5.0

- In his endeavours as Chairman of the Breërivier RSC and also a sheep farmer it was also his honest goal to prevent as far as possible the unnecessary killing of Bat-eared foxes, Cape Grysbokkies, Duikers and many other innocent animals when controlling problem animals. Therefore, he was also endeavouring that farmers must increasingly be able to help themselves in controlling problem animals. He was convinced sheep farmers shared this belief.
- As Chairman of the NWGA's Problem Animal Sub-committee, he also recognised the inefficiency of many hunt clubs. It was at Congresses of the Agricultural Union and the NWGA that farmers asked that the poison collar should be made available.
- In his opinion, the use of foothold traps, lures, poison ejectors, commando hunt and poison was in many cases a step backwards. Furthermore, the success of problem animal control could only be measured in the lamb crop and not by the customary way of stacks of skins of target and non-target animals. In this regard, he also wanted to move away from the word Poison Collar and preferably refer to it as the Small Livestock Protection Collar[218] or "*Livestock Protection Collar*".
- He believed the department shared his goal of conservation and that farmers being able to help themselves. To reach this goal and ideal the Breërivier RSC succeeded in getting P.D.B.1 registered in the poison collar.
- If the departments have any objections against the use of the poison collar, he would appreciate feedback in that regard.

In a letter dated 31 August 1989[219], Mr. Paul S. Buys (General Secretary: NWGA Natal & East Griqualand Branch) provided some information to Dr. H.O. Fourie (Ockie Fourie Toxicologists CC, Lynnwood), ostensibly in response to a request by telephone regarding problem animals:

- A critical investigation regarding the extent of problem animals in South Africa was attached; the damage caused by the problem animals were presented in its paragraph 1. Considerable progress was already made with this investigation.
- Dr. Fourie could contact Mr. Theuns Botha, Manager: NWGA and Secretary of the National Problem Animal Committee for more information.
- The possibility to attend a meeting of the Committee could also be discussed with Mr. Botha.

In a fax dated 1 September 1989[220], Dr. H.O. Fourie (Ockie Fourie Toxicologists CC, Lynnwood) provided his contact information to Mr. Paul Buys (General Secretary: NWGA Natal & East Griqualand Branch).

In a letter dated 8 September 1989[221] to Mr. P.M. Miller (MEC: Local Management & Community Services, NPA), Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) referred to the formers letter which was received on 30 June. Pursuant to a previous request and pending the completion of the provincial election of MEC's, Mr. Botha made a fresh request for arrangements of a meeting with the different provincial MEC's regarding problem animals. It would be appreciated if two possible dates and a venue could be suggested to inform the four members of the Problem Animal Committee accordingly.

In a letter dated 13 September 1989[222], Mr. P.M. Miller (MEC: Local Management & Community Services, NPA) referred to Mr. Theuns Botha's (Manager: NWGA) letter of 8 September 1989 and informed him the Administrators' Conference, which would also be

[218] "Kleinveebeskermingshalsband"
[219] File WK 40/2, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[220] File WK 40/2, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[221] File WK 40/2, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[222] File WK 40/2, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

attended by all the MEC's, was scheduled for 12 and 13 October in Bloemfontein. He was going to use the opportunity to consult with colleagues from the other provinces, suggest a common date for the envisaged meeting and persuade them that such a meeting is needed. However, given the recent changes in the Orange Free State and Transvaal Executive Committees, it must first be stablished who was responsible for problem animal control. He inquired with the Administrator's with whom to liaise in this regard. Mr. Botha was ensured that all steps necessary would be taken to hold the meeting before the end of 1989.

In a letter dated 17 October 1989[223], Mr. P.M. Miller (MEC: Local Management & Community Services, NPA) to Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA), he referred to his letter of 13 September 1989 and continued as cited below:

> "*I confirm that at the Administrators' Conference held in Bloemfontein on the 12th and 13th October I was able to meet the responsible MEC's in the other provinces and I have pleasure in informing you that it has been agreed that a meeting will be held on Monday, 27 November 1989 in Bloemfontein for purposes of discussing problems associated with problem animal control with our Association.*
>
> *I was able to obtain two dates this year at which all four Executive Committee Members could attend, and I would therefore urge your Association to make sure that your delegates are available to meet the Members of the respective Executive Committees and the relevant officials from their Nature Conservation Divisions in Bloemfontein on the day arranged.*
>
> *This meeting will take place in the afternoon of Monday, 27 November, starting as early as possible. This is necessary in order to enable Mr Fanie Ferreira MEC from the Transvaal Provincial Administration, to arrive in Bloemfontein in time for the meeting.*
>
> *Once confirmation has been received from your Association that the date, time and venue is suitable then further arrangements with regard to the detail, as to the exact venue in Bloemfontein will be made by Mr P J S Olivier MEC from the Orange Free State Provincial Executive.*"

In a letter dated 23 October 1989[224] to Mr. P.M. Miller (MEC: Local Management & Community Services, NPA), Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) acknowledged with thanks his letter of 17 October 1989 and wrote:

> "*The Problem Animal Committee of the National Wool Growers' Association has pleasure in accepting your suggestion of 27 November 1989 for discussions with other members of the Executive Committee of the Provincial Administration who are dealing with this matter.*
>
> *We are looking forward to being advised of the time of this meeting which is to be held in Bloemfontein, and also clarification on the following:*
>
> - *Who will be acting as Chairman*
> - *Who will be responsible for drafting an Agenda*
>
> *I will in office until Thursday, 26 October 1989, but thereafter I will be out of town until 13 November 1989.*
>
> *Thank you for taking the time to arrange this meeting.*"

An NWGA Circular (typist's date 1989.10.25)[225] was addressed to Messrs. P.F. Hugo - Chairman, P.E Kingwill, W.J. Wessels, A. Pretorius, J.L. van der Walt, D.J. Visser, B.P. Johnstone, G. du Plessis. <u>Discussions between the N.G.W.A., R.P.O. & Provincial Administrations regarding problem animals</u>.

[223] File WK 40/2, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[224] File WK 40/2, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[225] File WK 40/2, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

- The Provincial Administration has just informed them that at last it was succeeded to arrange a date for discussions with all four Provincial Administrations, MEC's and officials responsible for Environmental Affairs.
- The meeting was planned for Monday 27 November in Bloemfontein. The exact time and venue was not known yet, but would be communicated once it was confirmed.
- The meeting would probably start at 13h30.
- Travel and accommodation expenses would be reimbursed after the meeting.
- Copies of correspondence, as well as the minutes of a meeting of the Problem Animal Working Committee which was held during 1988, were attached.
- It was trusted that the meeting would provide direction to tackle the problem in a coordinated manner.

A NWGA Supplementary Circular (typist's date 1989.10.26)[226] was addressed to Messrs. P.F. Hugo - Chairman, P.E. Kingwill, W.J. Wessels, A. Pretorius, J.L. van der Walt, D.J. Visser, B.P. Johnstone and G. du Plessis. Discussions between the N.G.W.A., R.P.O. & Provincial Administrations regarding problem animals.

- It was just learned that the meeting would start at 14h00 on Monday 27 November at the 4th floor of the Main Provincial Building, Bloemfontein and chaired by Mr. P.M. Miller.
- It would be appreciated everybody could meet at 12h00 in the Holiday Inn, Bloemfontein for lunch and discussions before the meeting that afternoon.
- An agenda would be provided shortly before the meeting.

In a letter dated 1 November 1989[227] to Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA), Mr. D.J. Visser (Director: NWGA/Wool Production) apologised for not being to attend the meeting on 27 November 1989 in Bloemfontein. He was already engaged in a prior commitment in Pretoria.

On 20 November 1989[228], Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) provided Mr. P.M. Miller (MEC: Local Management & Community Services, NPA) a faxed cover letter, an agenda for the meeting (and a 20-page addendum) which was scheduled for 27 November 1989 in Bloemfontein.

Representatives of the NWGA, RPO and the four provincial authorities met on Monday 27 November 1989 (14h00) at the 4th Floor, H.F. Verwoerd Building, Bloemfontein, Free State Province. The meeting was attended by: Messrs. P. Miller (Chairman / MEC: NPA), D. Adams (MEC: CPA), J.F. Jooste (CPA), A.C. Harvey-Williams (NPA), D.J. Cook (Natal Parks Board), P.J.L. Olivier (MEC: PAO), Dr. G.F. Barkhuizen (PAO), Messrs. G.P. Visagie (TPA), M.J. Dewe (TPA), T. Potgieter (Oranjejag), Mrs. E. Brand (Oranjejag), Messrs. H.C. Beckmann (PAO), J. Booysen (PAO), J.L. van der Walt (RPO), G. du Plessis (RPO), P.E. Kingwill (NWGA), P.F. Hugo (NWGA), A.P. Pretorius (NWGA), B.P. Johnstone (NWGA), W.J. Wessels (NWGA), T.F.J. Botha (NWGA). Excerpts from the minutes are cited:

- **Mr. P.M. Miller**, the Chairman, welcomed all present and thanked the Free State Provincial Administration for making the facilities available for the meeting.
- An apology was received for Mr. F. Ferreira, MEC: TPA and Mr. G.P. Visagie would represent Transvaal.
- The issue as viewed by the producers: **Mr. P.F. Hugo**, Chairman: Problem Animal Committee addressed the meeting. He highlighted the more important bottlenecks as experienced by producers, namely that farmers and hunt organisation who must address the problem were prevented from crossing provincial borders, state land (defence force) and

[226] File WK 40/2, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[227] File WK 40/2, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[228] File E 12/1 Natal Parks Board, Pietermaritzburg.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

nature conservation areas. It hindered purposeful control and was often the breeding ground of the problem. The small livestock farmer committed himself to assistance - not necessary financial assistance - but also expected sympathy and cooperation from the institutions involved at state land.

- Viewpoint of each of the Provincial Authorities regarding problem animal control with special reference to: (a) Control, (b) Funding for research on problem animals, (c) Policy regarding the protection and population growth in nature reserves, and (d) Policy regarding liaison with producers and private institutions with a view to address the problem.
- **Mr. P.J.S. Olivier, MEC Free State**, started the discussions, stating: (a) The province was in favour of purposeful control, (b) It was longstanding common practice that funds were allocated for research and studies were conducted on a regular basis regarding the way in which the problem affected the agricultural sector in particular, (c) The province regard it as an assignment to conduct problem animal control on nature reserves, and (d) Through Oranjejag close liaisons were maintained with producers and members of the Oranjejag's Management were also nominated and elected by producers. The door of the Provincial Administration was always open for producers if they preferred to make direct presentations via their agricultural organisations.
- **Mr. Olivier** conceded that farmers in the Free State annually incurred losses of thousands of Rand because of the problem. He emphasised that surveys undoubtedly identified vagrant dogs as the main single source of problem animals; losses caused by vagrant dogs were three times as much as all the other losses put together. He suggested that other means, in addition to Oranjejag were needed to control vagrant dogs.
- Regarding crossing of borders, **Mr. Olivier** said in the past several requests were received for Oranjejag to operate across borders. However, for obvious reasons the requests could not be complied with – partly because of Oranjejag's workload in the Free State, they would hardly be able to cope with it by themselves.
- **Mr. D. Adams, MEC Cape Province**, said in the Cape Province recognised hunt clubs might cross farm borders during hot pursuit operations. The question of crossing of provincial borders is not addressed in the Ordinance. Proposals in this regard would be welcomed. Solutions are also needed to address the problem relating to state land and land of private institutions. Success was obtained by placing foothold traps and cage traps just outside nature areas adjacent to farms. The Cape Province subsidised recognised hunt clubs. He agreed that vagrant dogs was a unique problem that required special measures.
- **Mr. G.P. Visagie**, representative for **Transvaal**, said the policy in the province was that everybody was for himself, including the government. However, cooperative actions yielded the best results. The Transvaal Ordinance was geared to allow the farmers and their hunt clubs the opportunity to implement effective control. Regarding funding of research, it was a provincial responsibility. It must be kept in mind that problem animals were not only breeding in nature reserves but also on farms, therefore the problems must be addressed jointly. Liaison occurred at all levels in the province, especially through the Transvaal Federal Problem Animal Control Association and the problem animal unit at Groblersdal. Regarding provincial borders, no concrete proof was provided yet where indeed it was warranted. The Transvaal Ordinance only allowed hunting in an organised manner by institutions that were recognised by the Administrator.
- **Mr. P.M. Miller, MEC Natal**, said Natal bordered among other on Lesotho, Mozambique, Transkei, Transvaal and the Free State. Regarding hunting over borders Natal was administratively prepared to provide cooperation. He emphasised that no hunting on was allowed on a farm without the knowledge or consent of the owner. There was already an arrangement in place regarding cooperation between bordering farmers in the Harrismith area to address the problem on both sides of the provincial border.
- **Mr. Miller** said Natal viewed control measures in the first instance as the farmers' problem, which he should address as part of his normal farming risks. However, it is the

Version 5.0 - Do Not Wear - Version 5.0

province's duty to assist the farmer with knowledge and therefore a research project was launched to improve the knowledge of the province and the farmers. Many farmers were not knowledgeable regarding the issue. The project he referred to was aiming at identifying the animals that attacked the small livestock. The information was in both languages on video and will be made available as pamphlets. Vagrant dogs caused about 75% of the small livestock losses in Natal. The small livestock industry was only a small part of the total agricultural activities in the province; therefore, growth in population occurred in all probability at the same scale on farms as for forestry, sugarcane and nature reserves. The Parks Board were proactive in providing small livestock farmers with training and knowledge. He expressed his disappointment that farmers in Natal contributed so little funds towards a specific research project. A Problem Animal Advisory Committee was established in the province where producers and officials could liaise and deliberated the problems that were encountered. Attention was given to the issue of population growth on nature reserves. It was ironic that as many predators move from farming units to nature reserves as those that move in the opposite direction. The Ordinance was changed regarding vagrant dogs and now allowed for the immediate killing of such an animal when it was present on a farm.

- The issue was opened for discussion.
- **Mr. T.J. Potgieter**, founding member of **Oranjejag**, said Oranjejag may operate on defence force land in the Free State and there was good cooperation between producers and authorities. However, there were bottlenecks regarding hunting across provincial borders and population growth in bordering provinces. Regarding vagrant dogs specifically, he recommended the Potgieter Commission's Report was obtained and studied. **Action**.
- There was no reason why organisations like Oranjejag cannot be extended to other provinces. He offered his cooperation in that regard.
- **Mr. P.E. Kingwill**, President of the **NWGA of SA**, said it was primarily the farmer's responsibility to protect his flock and therefore all institutions involved should work in a manner that would make it easier for the farmer to assume the responsibility. For example, when farmers were not allowed to enter state or other land in controlling problem animals, these institutions must be held responsible to erect problem-proof fences and maintain it at their own expense. Regarding research, he said funding would not succeed if it were expected farmers should contribute on an *ad hoc* basis. The industry as an institution should contribute. This would happen when the industry was satisfied the research was well organised, was well controlled and that the research was requested by the industry itself. It must be implemented at a national level where these industries were represented. This approach should also result in clarifying: (i) who has what responsibilities, and (ii) it was agreed the planning of control should be made jointly by farmers, provincial authorities and nature conservation.
- **Mr. P.E. Kingwill**, proposed an overarching policy committee should be established to attend to matters such as research, training, development of methodologies, communication and legislation, but the actions formulated by the policy committee should be implemented according to the methods adopted by the different provinces or institutions. The committee may comprise representatives of the provincial authorities, departments of nature conservation, organised agriculture and Oranjejag.
- **Mr. G. du Plessis**, representing the **Red Meat Producers' Organisation** (RPO), seconded the proposal and gave his support for the committee on behalf of the RPO.
- **Mr. P.J.S. Olivier**, **Free State** supported in principle the idea of an overarching policy committee but emphasised the need for every province to act autonomous in accordance with its own approach to solve the problem. He also asked there should be differentiated between problem animals such as caracals and black-backed jackals on the one hand and vagrant dogs on the other hand. He also suggested the Minister of Agriculture must be consulted in establishing the Committee and that the composition of the Committee should be such that it could enjoy the necessary status in order to provide policy guidance.
- **Mr. G.P. Visagie**, **Transvaal** did not see any problem in establishing the committee.

Version 5.0 HC de Waal - Version 5.0

- **Mr. D. Adams**, **Cape Province** supported the proposal, but asked for wider discussions regarding vagrant dogs and that the RSCs in the Cape Province also be nominated on the committee. He emphasised the province's approach that famers should handle the problems themselves and the larger role private initiative could play through the RSCs regarding the organising of hunt clubs and training of hunters. He emphasised that the RSCs are moving very close to the farmers.
- **Mr. P.M. Miller**, **Natal** supported the idea on behalf of his province and suggested the NGWA should take the initiative in establishing the proposed committee.
- After further deliberation it was decided on the following plan of action:

1. The committee would be named the National Problem Animal Policy Committee.
2. It would be composed of representatives from the different provincial authorities, the divisions of nature conservation, organised agriculture comprising the RPO/NWGA and Game Committee, RSCs, Oranjejag, Federal Problem Animal Control Association and United Municipal Management.
3. The MEC's may serve *ex officio* on the committee.
4. The Terms of Reference of the Committee would be to determine overarching policy regarding: (a) research; (b) training; (c) communication (internal and external); (d) development of methodologies; (e) legislation; and (f) funding.

Nevertheless, the respective provincial authorities may interpret the policy as determined by the Committee when implementing the necessary actions.

5. Every institution would be responsible for the sustenance & travel costs of their representatives when attending meetings of the committee.
6. The Chairman of the committee would be elected at its envisaged first meeting.
7. The envisaged meeting was scheduled for 30 April 1990 in Bloemfontein; next meetings may rotate between different cities.
8. The PAO would provide facilities for the first meeting.
9. Mr. P.F. Hugo would continue negotiating with government to reduce or abolish the import tax on poison collars.
10. The newly established committee should consider the desirability of amending ordinances to allow for crossings of provincial border during hot pursuit actions.
11. In the meantime, Natal and the Free State would liaise directly on an *ad hoc* basis regarding problems affecting hunting across their provincial borders.
12. Another assignment of the committee was to scrutinise the research projects, which have been conducted and evaluate it.
13. The committee would also consider the desirability to compile a problem animal manual. In the meantime, the experts of the respective provinces would consider what documented information was available and present it to the meeting. The list of available material should be distributed to the respective provinces for them to determine what would be important to use in future. **Action:** Divisions Nature Conservation/Respective Provinces
14. Each province would make a presentation regarding work already conducted and which would be of interest to farmers. The committee would further evaluate the matter.
15. The committee would view a video on problem animals, produced by Natal.
16. The NWGA would be responsible for drafting an agenda.

- The **Chairman** thanked everybody for their attendance and especially the PAO for the arrangements and reception of attendees.
- On behalf of the producers, Mr. P.E. Kingwill also expressed his appreciation.
- The meeting was adjourned at 16h20.

Following the meeting on 27 November 1989 in Bloemfontein, the following a press statement was released:

"*Press release – for immediate use*

National Problem National Problem Animal Policy Committee established

Version 5.0 - HG de Waal - Version 5.0

__Port Elizabeth__: The Chairman of the Provincial Problem Animal Committee, Mr. P.M. Miller, MEC Natal, and the President of the NGWA of SA, Mr. Peter Kingwill announced in a joint release that a National Problem Animal Policy Committee will be established to attend in a coordinated manner to policy aspects for the control of problem animals.

The establishment of the committee followed on deliberations earlier the week in Bloemfontein between representatives of the National Wool Growers' Association, the Red Meat Producers' Organisation, MEC's of the respective provinces, nature conservation divisions and Oranjejag.

Two years ago the NWGA and RPO established a problem animal committee to bring together role players who were engaged in research and control with a view to find solutions for a big problem, because the small livestock industry conservatively incurred losses of more than R20 million per annum.

Representatives of the four provincial authorities, the division of nature conservation, organised agriculture, regional services councils, Oranjejag, Federal Problem Animal Control Association of Transvaal and United Municipal Management will be invited to serve in the committee.

The committee will endeavour among other to determine overarching policy regarding research, training, communication, development of methodologies, legislation and funding, as well as other issues referred to it. The establishment of the committee enjoyed the full support of the provincial authorities.

They emphasised the Committee would not have executive powers because the respective provinces will decide how will in practice give effect to implementing the recommendations of the Committee.

Mr. Kingwill said although small livestock farmers regard it a primary responsibility to protect their flocks and control problem animals, all institutions involved should make it easier for the farmer to assume the responsibility.

"When farmers or hunt organisations were not allowed to enter state or other land when controlling problem animals, these institutions must be held responsible to erect problem-proof fences and maintain it at their own expense and also assist farmers to set cage traps."

In turn, Mr. Miller said surveys which were conducted by provincial authorities showed that vagrant dogs was the single largest group of problem animals causing damage and that special measures should be implemented to address the issue.

The policy committee will convene on 30 April 1990 for its first meeting in Bloemfontein.

All inquiries regarding the committee may be directed to the Manager: NWGA, Port Elizabeth.

The press release was issued on behalf of

Mr. P.E. Kingwill, President NWGA of SA, Port Elizabeth.

Mr. P.M. Miller, MEC, Natal Provincial Administration, Pietermaritzburg."

Mr. Theuns Botha (Secretary: NPAPC) faxed a letter, dated 28 November 1989[229], to Mr. Chris Mocke, Chief Executive Officer, Western Cape RSC, Cape Town, regarding the NPAPC. With reference to the meeting, which was held the previous day in Bloemfontein, a summary was provided on the justification for establishing the committee, its composition and the Terms of Reference. Mr. Mocke was requested to nominate a representative on behalf of the RSC. The past two years Mr. P.F. Hugo, Chairman of the Breërivier RSC, was the Chairman of the NWGA's Problem Animal Committee. Therefore, it would be appreciated if Mr. P.F. Hugo, with his intimate knowledge of problem animals, could be nominated to represent the RSC on the

[229] File WK 40/2, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

committee. He was reminded that the RSC would be responsible for the sustenance & travel costs of its representative on the committee. A favourable answer was awaited.

Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) posted a circular letter, dated 30 November 1989[230], to Messrs. D. Adams (CPA), P.M. Miller (NPA), P.J.S. Olivier (PAO) and G.P. Visagie (TPA). On behalf of Mr. Peter Kingwill, President of the NWGA of SA, he thanked the gentlemen for travelling to Bloemfontein and addressing the NGWA's Problem Animal Committee. It was a meaningful meeting and after the meeting was concluded one of the representatives said: "*…the first time in my experience of 30 years with problem animals, I gained the impression that we are moving in a positive direction*." The minutes would be posted the following week. Everybody was wished a blessed Christmas and a prosperous new year.

In a letter dated 5 December 1989[231], Mr. Deon Adams (MEC: CPA) referred to Mr. Theuns Botha's letter of 30 November 1989, and expressed his own sincere appreciation towards a newly acquainted friend at the meeting in Bloemfontein.

Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) posted a circular letter, dated 6 December 1989[232], to Dr. G.F. Barkhuizen (PAO) and Messrs. J.F. Jooste (CPA), G.P. Visagie (TPA) and D.J. Cook (Natal Parks Board) regarding the NPAPC:

1. Attached was a draft copy of the minutes of the meeting, which was held the previous week in Bloemfontein. Suggestions regarding any changes should be made before the 15th of January.
2. They were reminded about paragraphs 2, 3, 13 and 14 in the draft minutes. It would be appreciated if the gentlemen could assist in obtaining the information.
3. They should also provide the names of persons nominated to represent them at the meeting by no later than the end of January.
4. For their attention, a press release was attached.

Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) also posted a circular letter, dated 6 December 1989[233], to the Provincial MEC's[234] regarding the NPAPC:

1. Attached was a draft copy of the minutes of the meeting, which was held the previous week in Bloemfontein. Suggestions regarding any changes should be made before the 15th of January.
2. They were reminded about paragraphs 2, 3, 13 and 14 in the draft minutes. It would be appreciated if the gentlemen could assist in obtaining the information.
3. They should also provide the names of persons nominated to represent them at the meeting by no later than the end of January.
4. For their attention, a press release was attached.

Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) posted a circular letter, dated 6 December 1989[235], to Messrs. A.C. Harvey-Williams (NPA), M.J. Dewe (TPA), H.C. Beckmann (PAO), J. Booysen (PAO), G. du Plessis (RPO), P.E. Kingwill (NWGA), A.P. Pretorius (NWGA), B.P. Johnstone (NWGA), W.J. Wessels (NWGA) regarding the NPAPC. A draft copy of the minutes of the meeting, which was held the previous week in Bloemfontein, was attached. Any suggestions

Version 5.0 - HC de Waal - Version 5.0

[230] File WK 40/2, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[231] File WK 40/2, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[232] File WK 40/2, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[233] File WK 40/2, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[234] Messrs. D. Adams (Cape Provincial Administration), P.M. Miller (Natal Provincial Administration), P.J.S. Olivier (Free State Provincial Administration) and G.P. Visagie (Transvaal Provincial Administration).
[235] File WK 40/2, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.

regarding changes should be made before 15 January. A press release was also attached for their information.

Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) posted a letter, dated 6 December 1989[236], to Mrs. Esther Brand, Director: Oranjejag in Bloemfontein regarding the NPAPC. A draft copy of the minutes of the meeting, which was held the previous week in Bloemfontein, was attached. Any suggestions regarding changes should be made before 15 January. The name of a person nominated to represent Oranjejag at the meeting should be submitted by no later than the end of January. A press release was also attached for her information.

Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) posted a letter, dated 6 December 1989[237], to Mr. J.L. van der Walt, Manager: RPO (Pretoria) regarding the NPAPC. A draft copy of the minutes of the meeting, which was held the previous week in Bloemfontein, was attached. Any suggestions regarding changes should be made before 15 January. It would be appreciated if it could be confirmed who would represent the RPO and the Game Association on the Committee. A press release was also attached for his information.

Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) posted a letter, dated 6 December 1989[238], to Mr. P.F. Hugo in Worcester regarding the NPAPC. A draft copy of the minutes of the meeting, which was held the previous week in Bloemfontein, was attached. Any suggestions regarding changes should be made before 15 January. He also reminded of paragraph 9 in the list of decisions, namely to continue negotiating with the government to reduce or abolish the import tax on poison collars. He informed Mr. Hugo that a fax[239] was sent to the Chairman: RSC to nominate a person, but was still awaiting a response. A press release was also attached for his information.

In a letter dated 7 December 1989[240] to Mr. Koekemoer (Chairman: United Municipal Management), Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) referred to the envisaged NPAPC. With reference to the meeting that was held the previous day in Bloemfontein, a summary was provided on the justification for establishing the committee, its composition and the Terms of Reference. He inquired whether Mr. Koekemoer would be interested to nominate a representative on behalf of the United Municipal Management. The first meeting of the committee was planned for 30 April 1990 in Bloemfontein. He was reminded that each institution would be responsible for the sustenance & travel costs of its representative on the committee. A press release was also attached for his information.

Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) posted a letter, dated 14 December 1989[241], to the Secretary: Federal Problem Animal Control Association, Ermelo regarding the envisaged NPAPC. With reference to the meeting, which was held the previous day in Bloemfontein, a summary was provided on the justification for establishing the committee, its composition and the Terms of Reference. He inquired whether the Federal Problem Animal Control Association would be interested to nominate a representative on the committee. The first meeting of the committee was planned for 30 April 1990 in Bloemfontein. He was reminded that each institution would be responsible for the sustenance & travel costs of its representative on the committee. A press release was also attached for his information.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

[236] File WK 40/2, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[237] File WK 40/2, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[238] File WK 40/2, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[239] 28 November 1989, File WK 40/2, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[240] File WK 40/2, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[241] File WK 40/2, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.

Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) posted a letter, dated 14 December 1989[242], to Mr. S.C.C. Ferreira (MEC: TPA, Pretoria) regarding the envisaged NPAPC. He acknowledged that Mr. Ferreira could unfortunately not attend, but the apology was noted and Mr. G.P. Visagie represented him at the meeting. Attached was a draft copy of the minutes of the meeting and a press release for his information; it was expected Mr. Visagie would provide further briefing. With reference to page 5 of the minutes he was reminded that provincial authorities, as well as the divisions nature conservation, should nominate representatives on the committee in due time.

In a letter dated 18 December 1989[243], Mr. Chris Mocke, Director: RSC Association of South Africa, Cape Town responded to Mr. Theuns Botha's (Secretary: NPAPC) faxed letter of 20 November 1989. The Executive Council of the Association decided that Mr. P.F. Hugo, Chairman of the Breërivier RSC, would represent the Association on the NPAPC.

1990

In a letter dated 16 January 1990[244], Mr. van Wyk (On behalf of the Director General) wrote to Mr. P.S. Buys (General Secretary: NWGA, Port Elizabeth) regarding some of the Points for Discussion at the forthcoming 64th Annual NWGA Congress, scheduled for 30 January to 1 February 1990 in Port Elizabeth. Excerpts from the comments are cited:

1. He referred to the document (KA 5.4 of 27 October 1989) of Mr. Buys.
2. Currently there was no evidence of an increase in the number of livestock killed by problem animals in areas adjacent to conservation areas. To the contrary, several studies showed that good conservation management did not serve as breeding ground for problem animals.
3. Problem animal control was a normal facet of livestock farming and therefore in his opinion the associated costs were part of the production input. Therefore, government cannot accept any financial responsibility, although the Chief Directorate Nature and Environmental Conservation subsidised problem animal hunt clubs as a gesture.
4. There were no self-governing areas in the Cape Province and the CPA cannot express itself regarding the situation in such areas, but if there was evidence that problem animals originating from self-governing areas, the different Provincial Administrations may be approached to provide advice to the self-governing authorities. Regarding independent state such as the Transkei, Ciskei or Bophuthatswana, these states should be approached via the Department of Foreign Affairs.
5. When farmers suspected that problem animals originated from conservation areas under the control of the Chief Directorate Nature and Environmental Conservation and caused damage on adjacent farms, they would investigate the cases and if indeed there were problem animals, control would be conducted. If farmers have the necessary evidence of damage caused by problem animals that originated from conservation areas, they were welcome to approach the Chief Directorate individually. This offer applied only to conservation areas under the control of the Chief Directorate. Where the land of other government departments were involved, farmers should approach those institutions.

In a letter dated 22 January 1990[245], Mr. D. Adams (MEC: CPA) referred to Mr. Theuns Botha's letter (File WK 40 of 6 December 1989) and confirmed that he would serve *ex officio* on the NPAPC. In addition, he nominated Mr. J.D. (Niel) van Wyk, Deputy Director as the representative of the Chief Directorate Nature and Environmental Conservation.

[242] File WK 40/2, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[243] File WK 40/2, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[244] File ANO/9/7 General Provincial Services Branch, Chief Directorate Nature and Environmental Conservation, Provincial Administration of the Cape of Good Hope.
[245] File ANO 9/3 Executive Committee, Province of the Cape of Good Hope.

Version 5.0 Hoc de Waal Version 5.0

In a letter dated 23 January 1990[246], Mr. J.F. Koekemoer (Director: United Municipal Management) referred to Mr. Theuns Botha's (Manager: NWGA) letter of 7 December 1989. The invitation to nominate a representative of the United Municipal Management on the NPAPC would be considered at a meeting of the United Municipal Management on 15 March 1990. He would be in touch again after that meeting.

In a letter dated 2 February 1990[247], the Director General referred to Mr. Theuns Botha's (Manager: NWGA) letter (File WK 40 of 14 December 1989) to the Mr. Ferreira, MEC and was pleased to announce that Mr. G.P. Visagie was nominated to represent Transvaal on the NPAPC.

In a letter dated 2 February 1990[248], the Director General informed Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) that Dr. G.F Barkhuizen (Director: Nature and Environmental Conservation) and Mr. N. Ferreira (Nature Conservation Scientist, Problem Animal Research) were assigned to represent the Provincial Administration on the NPAPC.

In a letter dated 5 February 1990[249], Mr. D.J. Cook (Deputy Director: West) responded to Mr. Theuns Botha's (Manager: NWGA) letter dated 6 December 1989, and pursuant to his own previous letter regarding the information requested by the NPAPC:

- Mr. D.J. Cook will represent the Parks Board on the Committee.
- A list of 16 articles on proclaimed problem animals in Natal and investigations conducted in this regard were provided.
- A video on the control of problem animals and related issues would be available at the next Committee meeting. The video was highlighting the most recent research conducted in Natal, in line with the research project, which was financed by the NPA and conducted by the University of Natal.

In a letter dated 16 February 1990[250], the Director General referred to Mr. Theuns Botha's (Manager: NWGA) letter (6 December 1989) and the telephone conversation with Mr. Botha's secretary Miss. Vander Westhuizen the previous. It was confirmed that Mr. P.M. Miller (MEC), Dr. J. Scrothcer (Natal Parks Board) and Mr. K. Pillay were assigned to represent the Administration on the NPAPC.

An undated handwritten note on file referred to a telephone caller, Mr. Maartins from Kokstad to the NWGA office in Port Elizabeth. He complained about the 90c/ha, which cattle farmers should contribute towards the maintenance of Jackal Clubs. He said he would sent the receipt for the payment (as proof of his complaint).

In a fax dated 27 February 1990[251], the Mr. M.V. Orban, Registrar: Act 36 of 1947, informed Mr. Paul Buys (General Secretary: NWGA) about the status and availability of the poison collar. The poison collar[252] was registered by Agrihold (Pretoria) and was distributed by Jeff Dyer Enterprises. According to Agrihold, there were no problems with the supply of the active ingredient PB1. Any further inquiries could be directed to Mr. Dyer or Mr. Bill Cullen of Agrihold.

[246] File U 1/7 United Municipal Executive of South Africa, representing Local Government in the Republic and South West Africa.
[247] File TN 1/13/2/2 Directorate: Nature and Environmental Conservation, Transvaal Provincial Administration.
[248] File N10/1/81 Directorate: Nature & Environmental Conservation, Orange Free State Provincial Administration.
[249] File E 12/1 Natal Parks Board.
[250] File 12/3/1/1 Natal Provincial Administration.
[251] File WK 40/2, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[252] See also letters dated 22 March 1988, 17 May 1988 and 27 February 1990.

Version 5.0 - HC de Waal - Version 5.0

In a letter dated 2 March 1990[253], Mr. P.M. Miller (MEC: Local Management & Community Services, NPA) informed the Manager: The Natal & East Griqualand Branch, National Woolgrowers' Association (Port Elizabeth) about a forthcoming Problem Animal Control Course:

> "*Further to previous correspondence on the subject of problem animal control, plus my active participation in discussions on this subject at your congresses in Natal and my undertaking that through our Nature Conservation Authority, the Natal Parks Board, we will do everything possible to assist small stock farmers in this area to combat problem animals, I wish to draw to your attention the fact that the Natal Parks Board will be holding a Problem Animal Control Course for Parks Board Zone Officers and for farmers at the Spioenkop Nature Reserve in the Natal Midlands on the 20th and 21st March 1990. I attach a copy of the very comprehensive programme for the training course and, as you will see, it deals with everything from predator trapping techniques right through to the use of electric fencing in predator control. This course is being offered by the finest experts that we can gather at one venue and I therefore urge you, as the voice of the wool producer, to do everything in your power to see that the wool farmers of Natal, who are experiencing problems, attend the course. Information on the course can be obtained by writing to the Director, Natal Parks Board (address in Pietermaritzburg), for attention Mr. R J Jennings (or phone number for the latter)*
>
> *Be assured that I will be monitoring the interest of the farmers and their attendance at this course in order to see just how seriously they wish to combat problem animals in this area.*
>
> *Your co-operation in obtaining as good an attendance as is possible will be very much appreciated. Could I please rely on you to keep all your branches and other organisations in the Natal region informed of this course.*"

The 2-day programme for the Problem Animal Control Course conducted at the Spioenkop Nature Reserve included the following aspects:

- Tuesday 20 March 1990 – Predator trapping techniques – full day presented by Peter Schneekluth (Programme to be produced by C Wright).
- Wednesday 21 March 1990 – A brief introduction to jackal and caracal; Research report back on: (a) killing and feeding patterns, (b) use of scent 1, (c) use of toxic collars , and (d) foot placement patterns. Practical: Sheep kills – identifying killing and feeding patterns (participant's skin out a number of sheep to identify problem predator); coyote getters – all topics presented by Tony Bowland.
- Use of electric fencing in predator control – presented by Jim Kennedy M.E.P.S Electronics.
- The role of the Bush Veld Bureau in predator control – presented by Barry Jones.
- Review.

In a letter dated 20 March 1990[254], Mr. J.F. Koekemoer (Director: United Municipal Management) referred to Mr. Theuns Botha's (Manager: NWGA) letter dated 7 December 1989 and his letter dated 23 January 1990. On 15 March 1990, the United Municipal Management discussed the invitation to nominate a representative on the National Problem Animal Committee. The United Municipal Management appreciated the invitation to nominate a representative. However, because this problem did not exist within the boundaries of municipalities, it resolved to decline the invitation.

[253] File WK 40/2, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[254] File U1/7 United Municipal Executive of South Africa, representing Local Government in the Republic and South West Africa.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

In a letter dated 21 March 1990[255], Mr. P.J.S. Olivier (MEC) acknowledged receipt of Mr. Theuns Botha's (Manager: NWGA) letter (File WK 40 of 6 December 1989) and the minutes of the meeting which was held on 27 November 1989. The Administrator approved that Dr. G.F Barkhuizen, Director: Nature and Environmental Conservation and Mr. N. Ferreira responsible for problem animal research were assigned to serve in the NPAPC; he also confirmed that the Director General had already informed Mr. Botha accordingly. Attention was given to the matters referred to in points 13 and 14 of the minutes. The Directorate Nature and Environmental Conservation was compiling an information document for the control of problem animals in the Free State.

Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) faxed letter on 30 March 1990[256] to Mrs. Dorfling (Secretary of Mr. P.J.S. Olivier, MEC); he referred to their telephone conversation earlier the morning and confirmed plans for the forthcoming meeting of the NPAPC at 10h00 on Monday 30 April 1990 in Bloemfontein. At the previous meeting on 27 November 1989, Mr. Olivier indicated the facilities of Provincial Administration would again be available for a meeting. An exact number of attendees would only be known about a week before the meeting, but about 22 persons would be attending. If the Committee Room could accommodate that number of people, he requested Mrs. Dorfling to reserve it. It was expected the meeting would continue after lunch, therefore he was inquired about the possibility to arrange lunch and indicated the costs could be for the account of the NWGA.

On 5 April 1990[257] Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) faxed a detailed note to all members of the NPAPC, namely: (1) Federal Problem Animal Control Association – Mr. J.E. Pieterse; (2) CPA – Mr. D. Adams (MEC) and Mr. N. van Wyk; (3) NWGA of SA – Messrs. P.E. Kingwill, A.P. Pretorius, W.J. Wessels and T.F.J. Botha; (4) Natal Parks Board – Mr. D.J. Cook; (5) NPA – Mr. P. Miller (MEC), Dr. J. Scrothcer and Mr. K. Pillay; (6) Oranjejag – Mr. G. Nel; (7) PAO – Mr. P.J.S. Olivier, Dr. G.F. Barkhuizen and Mr. N. Ferreira; (8) Red Meat Producers' Organisation – Mr. G. du Plessis and J.L. van der Walt; (9) RSC – Mr. P.F. Hugo; (10) TPA – Mr. G.P. Visagie; (11) United Municipal Management – Free State representative; and (12) Game Committee – Mr. J. le R Pieterse.

- They were notified about the first meeting of the NPAPC, scheduled for 10h00 on Monday 30 April 1990 in the Board Room, 4th Floor, Provincial Administration Main Building.
- They were reminded about the Committee's Terms of Reference, namely to determine overarching policy regarding: (a) research; (b) training; (c) communication (internal and external); (d) development of methodologies; (e) legislation; and (f) funding.
- A chairman would be elected and a secretariat assigned at the meeting.
- An agenda would be posted on 18 April 1990. They were reminded of a previous letter advising on provincial presentations regarding all aspects of problem animals (including research). A video was received from Natal, as well as the Southern-Cape's action plan on problem animal control.
- It would be appreciated that no presentation/submission exceed 20 minutes.
- It was necessary to arrange for lunch. The attendees would be the guests of Mr. Olivier (MEC: PAO); therefore, it would be appreciated if persons completed the attached RSVP card and return it as soon as possible.
- Everybody was reminded of being responsible for own travel arrangements.

[255] File N10/1/81 Executive Committee, Orange Free State Provincial Administration.
[256] File WK 40/2, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[257] File WK 40/2, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.

Version 5.0 - HD de Waal - Version 5.0

In a letter dated 10 April 1990[258], the Director General: Justice informed the General Secretary: NWGA about complaints received regarding the alleged abuses by farmers in the use of foothold traps[259]:

- The Department sporadically received requests calling for a change in legislation with a view on the complete banning of foothold traps as an undesirable method to get rid of predators. Such requests were usually received from the "*Animal Anti-Cruelty League*" and the Federation of Animal Protection Associations of South Africa and affiliated associations.
- A complete citation was provided of Section 2 of the Animal Protection Act of 1962.
- The complaints were very similar, namely the view that the use of foothold traps were inhumane and cruel, causing unnecessary pain and suffering to the animal caught in the trap. The suffering was exacerbated because the trapped animals were left for days because of the alleged neglect of farmers to inspect the traps on a daily basis.
- Furthermore, the complainants alleged that sales of foothold traps increased enormously despite the fact that only *bona fide* farmers were legally allowed to use foothold traps to catch predators. Evidence such as photographs were also received showing tame animals such as dogs and endangered animals such as the honey badger being caught in foothold traps.
- The complainants also indicated that the use of foothold traps have been banned since 1958 in countries such as Britain and proposed that South Africa followed that example. They also proposed that the farming community used cage traps instead of foothold traps to get rid of unwanted predators.
- The Association's comments and suggestions in this regard would be appreciated.

On 17 April 1990[260] Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) faxed an agenda to members of the NPAPC which was scheduled for 10h00 on 30 April 1990 in Bloemfontein. More points could be added to the agenda at the meeting. A thick document was received on the research and the courses presented by the CPA. However, it would only be available for perusal at the meeting. The meeting was scheduled for 10h00; therefore, persons flying from Cape Town, Durban and Johannesburg would be able to reach the venue in time. It was not foreseen that the meeting would continue past 15h00, therefore those persons could fly back home again the same day. The persons attending the meeting would be the guests of Provincial host, Mr. Olivier, MEC: PAO.

On 30 April 1990[261], Mr. P.S. Buys (General Secretary: NWGA) faxed information to Mrs. Dorfling (Secretary of Mr. P.J.S. Olivier, MEC: PAO) and requested her to hand it to Mr. Theuns Botha who was at the venue where the NPAPC convened. It was an excerpt from the minutes of a recent NWGA Congress, referring to a point of discussion: "*46 Probleemdiere / Predators*". Mr. Botha was referred to page 72, which dealt specifically with the concerns expressed by the congress regarding the Amendment Bill on the Handling of Firearms.

The NPAPC met for the first time at 10h00 on Monday 30 April 1990[262] in the Board Room, 4th Floor, Provincial Administration Main Building, Bloemfontein. The meeting was attended by: Mr. P.J.S. Olivier (MEC: PAO), Dr. G.F. Barkhuizen (PAO), Messrs. G.P. Visagie (TPA), G.D. Laws (NPA), A.C. Harvey-Williams (NPA), D.J. Cook (Natal Parks Board), G. Nel (Oranjejag), T.F. Roux (Oranjejag), P.F. Hugo (RSC), J.L. van der Walt (RPO), C.L. Greyling (Federal Problem Animal Control Association), M. van der Merwe (Federal Problem Animal Control

[258] File 8/6/Die/2/(WD) Department of Justice, Pretoria (inquiries H. Krüger).
[259] Editor's Note: At the time these trapping devices were referred to as "gin traps" (in Afrikaans "*slagysters*").
[260] File WK 40/2, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[261] File WK 40/2, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[262] File WK 40/2, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV; the Minutes were only distributed on 26 June 1990 to members of the Committee.

Version 5.0 - Hoc de Waal - Version 5.0

Association), P.E. Kingwill (NWGA of SA), A.P. Pretorius (NWGA of SA), W.J. Wessels (NWGA of SA) and T.F.J. Botha (NWGA of SA). Excerpts from the minutes are cited:

- Welcoming and apologies: Mr. P.J.S. Olivier (MEC) took the chair, welcomed all present and noted the following apologies: Messrs. N. van Wyk (CPA); N. Ferreira (PAO), G. du Plessis (RPO); J. le R. Pieterse (Game Committee SAAU). The United Municipal Management was not sending a representative. An apology was also noted for Mr. P.M. Miller (MEC: Natal) who was on a mission abroad.
- Election of a Chairman: Mr. P.J.S. Olivier called for nominations of a Chairman. Mr. P.E. Kingwill was nominated and seconded. No other nominations were offered and he was unanimously assigned Chairman.
- Assignment of a Secretary: Mr. P.E. Kingwill took the chair and thanked everybody for the confidence in him. Mr. T.F.J. Botha was assigned as Secretary of the Committee.
- Minutes of the previous meeting: The minutes were regarded as been read. Mr. A.P. Pretorius moved that the minutes be accepted as correct, which was seconded by Mr. W.J. Wessels.
- Overview of problem animal control in the respective provinces:
- (A) In the absence of Mr. N. van Wyk, the report received from the Cape Province was tabled; it was available at the secretariat.
- (B) A comprehensive report was compiled by Dr. G.F. Barkhuizen (Orange Free State Province) and served at the meeting. The report was handed out to the meeting and was therefore not noted in the minutes.
- (C) Mr. G.P. Visagie (Transvaal Province) justified why hunt hounds were nor bred in the Province. He said the Federal Problem Animal Control Association (FPACA) received a subsidy of only R55 000 per year. The Association served and area of more than 1 million ha and if possible the subsidy would have to be increased in future. Regarding research in Transvaal it was aimed in the past mainly focussed on the black-backed jackal and the baboon – good work have been done in this regard.
- The methods to catch baboons with cage traps have almost been perfected in the province. Bush pigs became a serious problem and was difficult to control. An intensive study of the problem was conducted in the province. He identified insufficient funds and real data on the extent and characteristic of damage caused by problem animals as the two bottlenecks, which should be addressed. He expressed his doubts regarding the selectivity of poison ejectors and said many “innocent” animals were killed with this device.
- Mr. G. Nel of Oranjejag did not agree. He said with the exception of the yellow mongoose, less than 5% “innocent” animals were killed if the poison ejectors were set correct. Farmers in the Free State were requested to keep the carcasses of livestock killed on their farms if they were not sure which animal was responsible for the killing. Experts of Oranjejag could then assist in identifying the correct problem animal involved.
- Mr. Visagie said the ecology and the type of wildlife in Transvaal and the Free State differed markedly.
- (D) Mr. D.J. Cook, Natal Parks Board provided an overview of activities in the province. A strategic plan for the control of problem animals was drafted. The two main objectives of the province were two find biologically acceptable methods to control problem animals and to assist farmers who are experiencing problems with advice. The former was especially aimed at getting the animal that caught the livestock and not to target the whole species. Application of several methods provided better results than using only one method. The philosophy of the Natal Parks Board regarding the problem in the province could be summarised by the approach to focus on flock protection instead of killing predators.
- There also was no reliable data reflecting how much money individual farmers lost annually because of problem animals. In Natal, three Ordinances were applying to problem animals. The more important Problem Animal Control Ordinance was administered by the

Version 6.0 - HD de Waal - Version 5.0

Provincial Administration; it included registration of hunt clubs, use of poison ejectors, etc. The Nature Conservation Ordinance was administered by Nature Conservation and focussed on the type of animals that were legally protected. This ordinance was recently changed and to allow that if poison was found on a farm it was accepted the farmer knew that the poison was on his farm. The third ordinance focussed on the licencing and control of dogs. A consequence of the ordinance was that if a dog caused damage on a farm it could be shot on sight.

- If at least six farmers decided to define a hunting area, they could approach the provincial authorities. These farmers must hold a meeting with all farmers in the relevant area or district and if the majority was in favour of such a hunt association, all the farmers in the district are compelled to join the club. There were 11 clubs in Natal; a club received 80% of its annual expenses to a maximum of R2 000 as subsidy from the authorities. It costs on average R24 000 per year to maintain a hunt club. The breakeven value to catch a black-backed jackal was R1 200. Hunt clubs in Natal was only 31% selective. The hunt clubs also did not address the issue of vagrant dogs. The use of poison ejectors was also not popular with farmers, even though they have received training to set it. Officials of the Natal Parks Board were advising farmers, but were not involved themselves in the control.
- Mr. Cook also referred to results obtained with the joint project of the province and small livestock farmers. The natal province contributed R75 000, while the farmers' associations contributed only R22 000; therefore, it was very unfortunate that the project had to be stopped because of insufficient funds. He also referred to a recent course presented for farmers to set foothold traps – only one farmer and one worker attended the course. According to Mr. Cook the ball was now in squarely in the court of the farmers and that the Natal Parks Board has done all it could to address the problem.
- <u>Discussion of the working document</u>: The Committee discussed the document [distributed with the Agenda]. The following principles were adopted as policy:
- (1) The farmer/landowner was primarily responsible to control problem animals.
- (2) Although problem animals were not regarded as a pest, provinces or regions have a financial responsibility to continue contributing towards the effective control of problem animals.
- (3) When it was desirable to hunt across provincial borders, i.e. during hot pursuit operations, it should be on basis of a negotiated agreement between authorities and landowners in the particular regions. The Committee did not support the preceding committee's proposal that ordinances should be amended to legalise hunting across farm/provincial borders.
- (4) The principle was supported that no institution may impede the activity of a farmer when he was executing his responsibility to control problem animals provided the control methods comply with established/acceptable norms.
- (5) The Committee recommended that reliable statistics on the real damage caused by problem animals be collected and in future be investigated by a research project.
- The following <u>specific recommendations</u> were made with a view to take decisions at the next meeting:
- <u>Research</u>:

1. It was recommended that each province conduct a literature search of research conducted specifically in the province and determine the remaining priorities. At the next meeting, motivated presentations should indicate the need for specific topics on the control of problem animals to be researched in their provinces.

Action: <u>The four Provincial Administrations and Divisions of Nature Conservation</u>

2. It was requested that experts of the Interprovincial Problem Animal Research Committee meet before the next meeting in order to present proposals to the NPAPC. Mr. Visagie would be the convenor of the Interprovincial Problem Animal Research Committee and he should arrange for a meeting. **<u>Action</u>**: <u>Mr. Visagie</u>

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

3. The Secretary was requested to forward the literature study on research already conducted, and which served at the NPAPC, to Mr. Visagie for evaluation and cognisance by the Interprovincial Problem Animal Research Committee. **Action**: Secretary

4. The Chairman ruled that every province might in future still address requests directly to the NPAPC for specifically aimed research needs that were not contained in the submission.

- If specific national research projects were identified and the committee made positive recommendations in that regard, there was the possibility to approach universities and have the research conducted by post-graduate students.
- It was requested that research already conducted on the following issues, namely: (a) water-resistant lures, (b) vagrant dogs, (c) calling devices, (d) a poison as substitute for 1080 for selective application, and (e) the after effects of existing poisons used to control problem animals,

be scrutinised by the expert committee and if more research was needed on the issues referred to, the committee should present a list of priorities, estimated costs and recommendations for consideration by the NPAPC at its next meeting.

Action: The four Provincial Administrations and Divisions of Nature Conservation

- After lunch, the Chairman said he gained the impression that training and communication was of more importance than research. He asked the meeting to give specific attention to this during further discussions. After discussions, it was decided that Mr. Cook of Natal should present proposals at the next meeting regarding: (a) the type of information to be communicated, (b) what methods to use for this purpose, e.g. videos, and (c) what channels to use for communication and training.
- It was inquired what the concrete proposals would be? **Action**: Mr. Cook
- Mr. P.F. Hugo said in his RSC, the same person managed environmental conservation and problem animals. The results were very good.
- Manual:
- The need for a manual for farmers, agricultural colleges and schools, and hunt associations invited much discussion. Natal said their nature conservation officials were conducting training. Transvaal said there was not much interest for such a manual in the province because the Federal Problem Animal Control Association was active and the farmers were not focussed on self-study. The Free State said Oranjejag could provide the training because the information was available, but funds were lacking to conduct training at a large scale. Furthermore, farmers in the Free State preferred that a single specialist organisation such as Oranjejag be involved with training and control of problem animals. The Provincial Administration, in cooperation with Oranjejag, was drafting a manual to advise farmers on how to help themselves and when a problem did arise how to address it themselves without having each time to call on Oranjejag to come and assist.
- The Chairman asked Dr. Barkhuizen to make the information, if it was already compiled, available to the committee at its next meeting – the other provinces could perhaps also benefit from it. **Action**: Dr. Barkhuizen
- It was the view of Mr. Cook that hunt clubs in Natal were the appropriate structure to train people who can be of further assistance in communities. The private sector could perhaps also be involved with training. In this regard, he was thinking specifically about the specialist organisations in the small livestock industry.
- After further discussion, the meeting agreed that the industries (wool and meat) could indeed make an effort to influence agricultural colleges positively to consider presenting problem animal courses. The division's nature conservation of the respective provincial authorities stated they would assist the colleges in their provinces to draft the curricula.

Action: Chairman/Secretary

- It was decided to request the division's nature conservation of the respective provinces to submit articles regarding problem animals and which can be of help to farmers to the

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

Secretary for distribution by the agricultural media. The name of the author would still appear with the article, but it would be provided to the media under the auspices of the NPAPC.

Action: Secretary/Divisions Nature Conservation

- The meeting was of the opinion that the existing exchange of information between the different provinces was effective.
- In view of the privatisation idea in South Africa, the private hunt organisation in Natal and the Cape could continue with their own methods of servicing farmers and unless they requested it specifically, did not have to be involved with the activities of the NPAPC.
- The opinion was expressed that much of the existing problems between the division's nature conservation and producers' organisations were because of poor communication. With the establishment of the National Problem Animal Policy Committee, those differences should be solved at the policy level.
- It was decided the Chairman should draft a press release for distribution after the meeting on the policy statements, objectives and progress of the NPAPC.

Action: Secretary/Chairman

- It was decided that the Administrators and the Minister of Environmental Affairs be informed about the Committee and its objectives. **Action**: Secretary
- It was decided that no other institutions would be involved at that stage, unless the Committee should deem it necessary in specific circumstances.
- Development of methodology:
- It was decided the existing methodology channels were sufficient and did not require high priority. The Departments were satisfied that the Interprovincial Problem Animal Research Committee was giving sufficient attention to development of methodologies. However, it was proposed to recommend to that committee to add standing points on the agenda, namely development of methodology and research. Any other issues raised at meetings of the NPAPC and has relevance to its activities could also be referred to that committee.

Action: Mr. Visagie

- It was especially in the field of technical research that mutual information was needed. The committee could also submit motivation for a specific project, which they deemed necessary. To the NPAPC and the latter could assist in obtaining funding for the project.
- Legislation:
- Changes to ordinances to legalise hunting across borders would no longer be requested.
- It was decided not to give any more attention to the problem of vagrant dogs, because farmers should develop their own solutions where it occurred and farmers could ask hunt organisations to address the problem.
- The Amendment Bill on the Handling of Firearms were briefly discussed. The Committee was of the opinion that it had no authority to express itself on the matter.
- Funding:
- The meeting could not attend to this matter, because there should be concrete proposals regarding research or any other issue requiring funding before the committee could address it.
- Abolishing the surcharge on poison collars:
- The Secretary was asked to lodge a request on behalf of the Committee to the relevant department to abolish the surcharge on poison collars. **Action**: Secretary
- Correspondence:
- A letter was received from the Department of Justice requesting the NWGA's comment regarding the injudicious use of foothold traps.
- After discussion, it was decided the Secretary should state the Committee's view, namely that the financial losses incurred by farmers necessitated the control of problem animals, a range of methods (including foothold traps) was needed to control the problem

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

animals, and the livestock that were caught experienced pain and suffering because they did not die immediately. Furthermore, the Department of Justice should be informed that the Committee was aware that misuse occurred in the setting of foothold traps, therefore this request would be communicated with farmers. **Action**: Secretary

- Fencing Act – request by RPO:
- It was the Committee's view that this matter was not a high priority and in view of the little background information, it could not be dealt with at that stage. However, it was the Committee's view that it was desirable that appropriate problem animal-proof fences, in accordance with prescribed specifications, should be erected and maintained between farmers and proclaimed nature conservation areas. **Action**: Secretary
- Next meeting:
- In view of possible recommendations regarding funding, it was decided the Committee would meet in such a way as to accommodate institutions responsible for funding to submit for expenses in a specific financial year. It was suggested the Committee should meet twice per year at six-monthly intervals.
- The next meeting was scheduled in the same venue in Bloemfontein for Thursday, 15 November at 10h00. It should also be considered to hold the next meeting after that at the Jan Smuts[263] Airport to make it easier for the members from Natal to attend.
- The Chairman thanked everybody for his or her support and presence.
- The meeting was adjourned at 16h30.

In a letter dated 2 May 1990[264] to Mr. P.J.S. Olivier (MEC: PAO), Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) conveyed the Chairman of the Problem Animal Policy Committee's appreciation on behalf of the Association for availing the facilities and in particular the excellent lunch. He reminded the MEC about the decision to hold the next meeting at the same venue on 15 November 1990 and inquired if it could be used again. The NWGA would like to act as host for the group during that meeting. If it was possible, he inquired how the NWGA could arrange and pay for the lunch by liaising with the MEC's secretary. On a personal note, the NWGA was looking forward to welcome Mr. Olivier and his wife, as the representative of the Administrator, at the NWGA's annual banquet.

In a letter dated 2 May 1990[265], the Director General: NPA, invited Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) to attend the final presentation on the study of predators on farmlands in Natal by Mr. Tony Bowland (University of Natal). The presentation was scheduled for Monday 28 May 1990 at 14h00, the Life Sciences Department, University of Natal, Pietermaritzburg. The NWGA received the letter on 9 May 1990 and Mr. Botha asked his secretary to offer his apologies by telephone to Lazelle Krog/Buddy Deetlefs.

In a letter dated 4 May 1990[266], Mr. J.D. van Wyk offered a *post facto* apology to Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) for being unable to attend the Problem Animal Policy Committee's meeting on 30 April 1990; he fell ill on the Sunday night and could not travel to Bloemfontein. The Chief Directorate Nature and Environmental Conservation, CPA stated the following in the Report (dated 30 April 1990):

- Research and development of methodology:
- A large research project was investigating the efficacy and costs of mechanical methods to control problem animals. The project was completed for caracals and baboons –

[263] Later renamed as O.R. Tambo International Airport, near Johannesburg.
[264] File WK 40/2, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[265] File 2/4/149/1 Director General Natal Provincial Administration (inquiries D. Deetlefs).
[266] File ANO 9/3 General Provincial Services Branch, Chief Directorate Nature and Environmental Conservation, Provincial Administration of the Cape of Good Hope.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

the appropriate methods for caracals were foothold traps and cage traps, and cage traps for baboons. The investigations for black-backed jackals were still in progress, but it seemed that poison ejectors and foothold traps would be the best methods. As soon as the project was completed, the results would be published.

- Another project in the Southern Cape was investigating the real damage caused by caracals. It was conducted in the Klein Karoo on farms where problems with caracals were recently reported.
- The use of electrified fences as preventative measure was also investigated. Provisional results suggest that electrified fences have great potential as a cost-effective method to exclude a range of problem animals from the camps of livestock.
- Training:
- Training of hunters was continued. The demand declined the past year and courses were only presented on demand. Private institutions were also providing training and in view of government's policy of privatisation, they were encouraged to present effective courses.
- Breeding of hunt hounds:
- Hounds were only bred when such orders were received. The service provided thus far would also be phased out as the private sector was gradually assuming the role of breeding hunt hounds.
- Funding:
- The RSCs and hunt clubs were subsidised with R43 000 in that financial year; the subsidy would be phased out over the next 5 years. About R150 000 was also spent annually on problem animal research.

In a letter dated 10 May 1990[267], Mrs. Dorfling (Secretary of Mr. P.J.S. Olivier, MEC: PAO), confirmed with Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) that the Committee Room, which was used during the previous meeting, was reserved for 15 November 1990.

In a letter dated 22 May 1990[268] to Mr. Theuns Botha (Secretary: NPAPC), Mr. W.F. Bruwer, Secretary: Douglas Farmers' Union inquired about the outcome of their recent Point of Discussion: Controlling Vermin which was submitted at the 1989 Northern Cape RPO Small Livestock Congress in Postmasburg. They were informed the item was forwarded to the committee; therefore, the Union requested further information regarding matter. It would also be appreciated if more information regarding the committee, for example how was it composed and its primary functions.

In a letter dated 22 May 1990[269] to Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA), Mr. B.J. Newey, Secretary: Nahoon and Gonubie Vermin Hunt Club, Kei Road, Eastern Cape inquired:

> "*Dear Mr. Botha,*
>
> *It was proposed by Mr. S. Knott at a recent meeting that we write to you in trying to obtain a subsidy for our Vermin Hunt Club.*
>
> *We are currently financed by: (a) A land levy of 7c per hectare (to be increased to 10c) collected on our behalf by the Amatola RSC which amounts to approximately R5 000 per annum. (b) An annual subsidy from the Amatola RSC of approximately R1 600. (c) Voluntary donations of R250 per member per annum, totalling approximately R7 000. (d) Any further donations received from the Berlin and Kei Road Farmers' Associations.*
>
> *With a feed bill of almost R1 000 per month, wages and rations for two dog handlers, veterinary and sundry other expenses we obviously operate on a tight budget.*

[267] File WK 40/2, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[268] File DBU 1/8 Douglas Boere-Unie.
[269] File WK 40/2, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

Our two hunting packs which consist of about 25 dogs operate very successfully, averaging kills of 60 jackal and 25 lynx per annum for the past five years. These results obviously go a long way towards making small stock farming a successful enterprise in this area.

Any subsidy which we might be able to receive would prove to be a great help in contributing to the success of the club.

Yours faithfully"

Attached to a fax dated 26 June 1990[270], Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) provided to Mrs. Jacobs, Secretary of Mr. G.P. Visagie (Division Nature Conservation, TPA) the minutes of the NPAPC (30 April 1990). Copies of the original literature studies, which were conducted by the provinces, would send by ordinary mail.

In a letter dated, 22 June 1990[271], addressed to the Editor NWGA Secretariat, Port Elizabeth, Mrs. V. Lindsay: Secretary Hanover Farmers' Association referred to the NWGA Newsletter No. 1 regarding information that the NPAPC was recently established. The increase in problem animals ("*ongediertes*"), namely caracals and black-backed jackals, in the Hanover district was worrying and the control of the problem remained a difficult issue. Hopefully the committee would take the lead in that serious and worrying issue. Feedback was requested in due course.

In a letter dated 26 June 1990[272] to Dr. G.F. Barkhuizen (OFS Provincial Administration), Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) provided a copy of the minutes of the NPAPC. Dr. Barkhuizen was reminded of the Chairman's request regarding the manual to which he referred and if possible, provided it was completed, it could be made available to members before or at the next meeting. He was also reminded of other actions noted in the minutes requiring his indirect involvement.

In a letter dated 26 June 1990[273] to Mr. G.P. Visagie (TPA), Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) apologised for the delay in providing a copy of the minutes of the NPAPC and referred to issues for his attention:

1 Research – page 4: The provinces should survey the literature available on research conducted in the province by their divisions of nature conservation, specifically on problem animals. Motivated presentations should be made at the next meeting if there was a need for any specific further research.

2 He was requested to convene a meeting of the Interprovincial Problem Animal Research Committee before the next meeting and present joint proposals to the NPAPC regarding the following matters: (a) water-resistant lures, (b) vagrant dogs, (c) calling devices, (d) a poison as substitute for 1080 for selective application, and (e) the after effects of existing poisons used to control problem animals.

3 Information on articles published by nature conservation officials and which could be of general interest to farmers in controlling problem animals would welcomed. The names of authors would be acknowledged.

4 The Interprovincial Problem Animal Research Committee was also requested to add two standing points on the agenda, namely development of methodology and research, with a view to exchange mutual relevant information between committees.

[270] File WK 40/2, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[271] File WK 40/2, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[272] File WK 40/2, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[273] File WK 40/2, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

In a letter dated 26 June 1990[274] to Mr. D.J. Cook (Natal Parks Board), Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) provided a copy of the minutes of the NPAPC and drew his attention to the following:

1 A literature study of research conducted in Natal and any further research needed.

2 Was research conducted in Natal on the following: (a) water-resistant lures, (b) vagrant dogs, (c) calling devices, (d) a poison as substitute for 1080 for selective application, and (e) the after effects of existing poisons used to control problem animals?

3 Mr. Cook said he would make a presentation with concrete proposals regarding communication and channels that could be used.

4 Any articles published by officials of the Parks Board and which was considered suitable for further distribution would be welcomed.

- Mr. Botha offered an apology for availing the minutes only in Afrikaans. If Mr. Cook preferred it, a translation could be provided.

In letters to all Members of the NPAPC, dated 26 June 1990[275], Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) apologised for the delay in providing a copy of the Minutes of the meeting of 30 April 1990[276]. Members were reminded about specific actions to be accomplished before the next meeting, which was scheduled at 10h00 on 15 November in Bloemfontein:

1 A survey of research conducted as well as a priority list of further research needed regarding control of problem animals. This assignment was directed at the Provincial Administrations and Divisions of Nature Conservation.

2 Mr. Visagie would endeavour to convene a meeting of the Interprovincial Problem Animal Research Committee before the next meeting to deliberate the matter.

3 Articles with reference to problem animals, which could be published in the agricultural media, was welcomed.

- Any corrections to the minutes were welcomed.
- A press release by the Chairman of the Committee would be distributed in due course.

In a letter dated 27 June 1990[277], Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) responded to the inquiry by Mr. Paul Buys about the concerns expressed at the Cape Province NWGA Congress' regarding the Amendment Bill on the Handling of Firearms regarding. Attached was a copy of the minutes. The Committee did not deem it wise to make representations because there must have been good reasons to amend it in that way.

In a letter dated 27 June 1990[278], Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) informed the Director General, Department of Trade and Industry about specific discussions at the NPAPC regarding the surcharge on the import of poison collars. It would be appreciated to be informed about the percentage surcharge at stake. In the past, presentations have been lodged to exempt poison collars from this tax.

In a letter dated 27 June 1990[279], Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) wrote to Mr. P.E. Kingwill (Chairman: NPAPC) about the following:

- Press release: A draft copy was attached; additions as required was welcomed.
- Training courses – agricultural colleges/schools: The Committee decided that the industry should start lobbying for the inclusion of problem animal courses in the curriculum of agricultural colleges and schools. The Divisions Nature Conservation indicated they could

[274] File WK 40/2, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[275] File WK 40/2, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[276] Editor's Note: The full text of the Minutes was presented previously on 30 April 1990.
[277] File WK 40/2, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[278] File WK 40/2, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[279] File WK 40/2, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.

Version 5.0 - H.J. de Waal - Version 5.0

possibly assist in compiling the curriculum. Mr. Botha inquired whether this request should be directed to the colleges by the Wool Board, because if was posed by the NWGA, the prior approval of its Central Management would be needed. He suggested Mr. Kingwill referred it first to the Wool Production Committee. Any suggestions were welcomed.

In a letter dated 27 June 1990[280], Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) responded to an inquiry by Mr. J.L. van der Walt (Manager: RPO) regarding a request on fencing received from the Northern Cape RPO. Having discussed the request, the NPAPC decided:

- "*It was the Committee's view that this matter was not a high priority and in view of the little background information it could not be dealt with at that stage. However, it was the Committee's view that it was desirable that appropriate problem animal-proof fences, in accordance with prescribed specifications, should be erected and maintained between farmers and proclaimed nature conservation areas.*"
- If more detail was available, it could be submitted again to the next meeting, which was scheduled for 15 November.

In a letter dated 27 June 1990[281] to Mr. P.J.S. Olivier (MEC: PAO), Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) referred to his letter of 2 May 1990 and inquired if the conference facilities could be reserved again for 15 November. As indicated previously, the NWGA would like to entertain the attendees for lunch. If that was not possible, alternative arrangements could made at a nearby restaurant. Advice would be welcome.

In letter dated 2 July 1990[282], Mr. Theuns Botha (Secretary: NPAPC) informed the four Provincial Administrators about the NPAPC and progress. The four Administrators were Mr. L. Botha - Orange Free State, Bloemfontein; Mr. C.J. van R. Botha - Natal, Pietermaritzburg; Mr. J.W.H. Meiring - Cape, Cape Town; Mr. D. Hough - Transvaal, Pretoria. The four letters were generic and stated:

- In view of the serious nature and therefore losses because of problem animals incurred by livestock farmers over the years, the NWGA of SA endeavoured the past 3 years to resolve the matter on a National basis with other role players.
- On 27 November 1989, a NPAPC was established. The committee comprised stakeholders from the four provincial divisions of nature conservation; representatives of the four Provincial Administrations; recognised hunt organisations; the RSC of the Cape Province, as well as the meat and wool industries. On 30 April, this committee met for the first time to formulate some policy statements, namely: (1) The farmer or landowner was primarily responsible to control problem animals. (2) Although problem animals were not regarded as a national pest, provinces or regions have a financial responsibility to continue contributing towards the effective control of problem animals. (3) When it was desirable to hunt across provincial borders, i.e. during hot pursuit operations, it should be on basis of a negotiated agreement between authorities and landowners in the particular regions. (4) The principle was supported that no institution may impede the activity of a farmer when executing his responsibility to control problem animals provided the control methods comply with established/acceptable norms. (5) The committee recommended that the collection of reliable statistics regarding the real damage caused by problem animals should in future receive attention by means of a research project.
- It should be emphasised that the Committee could not act in an executive capacity, but merely endeavours to coordinate in an advisory manner and to recommend among others regarding funding of identified projects.

[280] File WK 40/2, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[281] File WK 40/2, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[282] File WK 40/2, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.

Version 5.0 - H.C. de Waal - Version 5.0

- A copy of the press release issued by Chairman of the Committee was attached and it was hoped the activities and conduct of the Committee would receive the necessary support.
- The respective MEC's responsible for nature conservation/environmental affairs were fully informed about the objectives of the committee.

In letter dated 2 July 1990[283], Mr. Theuns Botha (Secretary: NPAPC) informed Mr. G.J. Kotzé, Minister of Environmental Affairs, about the NPAPC and progress. The letter was a copy of the letters that were also sent on 2 July 1990 to the four Provincial Administrators.

In a letter dated 2 July 1990[284], Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) thanked Mrs. V. Lindsay: Secretary Hanover Farmers' Association, for responding to the first NWGA Newsletter. Regarding the inquiry about the NPAPC, a copy of the recent press release was attached. The association was welcome to address any specific requests to the committee.

In a letter dated 2 July 1990[285], the Chief Executive Officer: Board of Trade and Industry referred to the letter (File WK 40/2 of 27 June 1990) of Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA), informing him the matter was attended to and if need be he would be contacted again.

The following press release, dated 3 July 1990[286], was issued on behalf of Mr. P.E Kingwill, Chairman: NPAPC:

*"**Policy Committee gives attention to problem animals***

***Port Elizabeth**: The serious losses suffered by small stock farmers as a result of problem animals and the apparent lack of mutual trust and communication between the various organisations involved with problem animal control, has led to a Problem Animal Policy Committee being formed, said Mr. P.E Kingwill, Chairman of the newly established Committee.*

Mr. Kingwill said after the first meeting of the Committee recently held in Bloemfontein and attended by representatives of the National Wool Growers' Association, the Red Meat Producers' Organisation, Department of Nature Conservation, Provincial Administrations of all four provinces, Hunting Organisations and the Regional Services Council, consensus had already been reached on various policy aspects.

This includes, amongst others, the following:

- *That the farmer/property owner is primarily responsible for the control problem animals.*
- *Although problem animals are not considered a national plaque, there is nevertheless a responsibility which rests on the provinces or regions to continue making a financial contribution towards the effective control of problem animals.*
- *Where it is necessary to hunt across provincial borders, i.e. during follow-up operations, it should be carried out because of a negotiated agreement between the authorities and the property owners in such areas.*
- *The committee is also of the opinion that no organisation may hinder the actions of the farmer while carrying out his duty in controlling problem animals if the methods used are in accordance with acceptable norms and stipulated rules.*

Mr. Kingwill said that although there has been much research carried out on problem animals in South Africa, it would appear that this research was not always done in a co-ordinated manner and did not contribute towards reliving the problem from the farmer's point of view.

[283] File WK 40/2, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[284] File WK 40/2, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[285] File WK 40/3, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[286] File WK 40/3, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.

Version 5.0 - Hope Wan - Version 5.0

As the wool industry has funded various problem animal research projects in the past, and as assistance has once again been requested, it has now been decided that in future, finance will only be granted once the proposed project has been submitted to the Policy Committee for evaluation, and the Committee has approved the project as being a worthy contribution towards combatting the problem.

There is already an established Inter-Provincial Problem Animal Research Committee whose knowledge is being utilised, and with whom close liaison will take place in the future.

Matters that may need further research in future are amongst others, water resistant baits, effective calling apparatus and alternative poisons with short acting after effects.

Mr. Kingwill said that as it was apparent during the discussions that a lack of communication existed between the farmer and Nature Conservation Organisations, and subsequently became the reason for mutual accusations and distrust, the Policy Committee will, in particular, strive to develop channels through which co-operation can be enhanced.

Mr. Kingwill expressed his appreciation to the Province's Department of Nature Conservation for their positive attitude in undertaking to advise the farmer in his discerned efforts to control the problem.

He said that a project will possibly be launched in which an attempt will be made to obtain reliable statistics on the real damage caused by the various species, in order to place more emphasis on those animals within a specie causing the most damage.

He mentioned that stray dogs are often the greatest single cause of stock losses and that the ordinance in Natal has recently been amended so that any dog hunting stock on a farmer's property can summarily be shot dead.

Farmers or Organisations requiring more information, or wishing to refer specific cases of problem animals to the Committee, can write to the Secretary: National Problem Animal Policy Committee.

The next Committee Meeting will be held in November."

In a circular to all Members of the NPAPC, dated 3 July 1990[287], Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) attached for their information a copy of the press release (dated 29 June 1990) by the Chairman of the NPAPC.

A news item appeared in the *Oosterlig*[288] of 4 July 1990, elaborating on the NPAPC, which was recently established in Bloemfontein. It briefly alluded to the recent press release (3 July 1990) which was issued on behalf of the Chairman, Mr. Peter Kingwill.

In a letter dated 4 July 1990[289] to Mr. Theuns Botha (Secretary: NPAPC), Mr. J.G. du Plessis, Boplaas, Humansdorp referred to the news item which appeared in the *Oosterlig* of 4 July 1990 and requested more information regarding problem animal control. Mr. du Plessis served on the Algoa RSC and represented the rural area of Humansdorp.

In a letter dated 7 July 1990[290], Mr. W.H. Ferreira (Private Secretary: Natal Administrator) acknowledged receipt of Mr. Theuns Botha's (Manager: NWGA) a letter (File WK 40/2 of 2 July 1990) on behalf of the Administrator. The content was noted and the matter was directed to Mr. P.M. Miller; an answer may be expected soon.

[287] File WK 40/2, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[288] Editor's Note: Local daily newspaper in Port Elizabeth.
[289] File WK 40/3, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[290] File A 22/2 Office of the Administrator, Province of Natal.

Version 5.0 - HD de Waal - Version 5.0

In a letter dated 11 July 1990[291], Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) responded to the letter dated 7 July 1990 of Mr. J.G. du Plessis, Boplaas, Humansdorp. A recent press release and a copy of the recent minutes of the NPAPC were attached. It was suggested Mr. Du Plessis contact him by telephone for more relevant information regarding the objectives of the NPAPC.

In a letter dated 11 July 1990[292], Mr. A. Swanepoel (Assistant Private Secretary to Mr. G.J. Kotzé, Minister of Environmental Affairs and Water Affairs) responded on his behalf to the letter (File WK 40 of 2 July 1990) of Mr. Theuns Botha (Secretary: NPAPC). The Minister was not available, but the matter would be brought to his attention when he became available.

In a letter dated 11 July 1990[293], Mr. B.P. Oberholzer (Assistant Private Secretary to the Administrator) acknowledged on his behalf with thanks the receipt of Mr. Theuns Botha's (Secretary: NPAPC) letter (File WK 40 of 2 July 1990) and attachment.

In a letter dated 16 July 1990[294], the Director: Management Advice Services of the CPA informed the Director: South African Agricultural Union about the outcome of an important investigation, namely a Function Clearing Programme[295] of the Chief Directorate: Nature and Environmental Conservation:

1. With reference to the Administration's functions regarding Problem Animal Control, and with a view to possibly stopping or privatising the function, the Executive Committee requested the results of the investigation referred to previously be submitted to you for comment before any steps were taken to implement the recommendations.
2. During the said investigation it was established the Administration previously played a very active role in problem animal control, but since 1985 the responsibility of the Chief Directorate: Nature and Environmental Conservation in this regard plateaued out to only controlling and paying out of subsidies; making hounds available for selling to hunt clubs; making cyanide cartridges and baits available and providing training to hunt clubs and farmers. Currently, RSCs and farmers were themselves primarily responsible for implementing problem animal control.
3. Fact is, the control of problem animals and even the subsidising of hunt clubs, had no bearing on the conservation assignment of the Chief Directorate. The control of problem animals was an activity exclusively aimed at protecting farming interests and, as such, should be undertaken by the farming community itself. The existence of 43 private hunt clubs was sufficient evidence that the farming community had already accepted this principle. At a nominal average subsidy of R828.60 per hunt club for the 1987/88 financial with respect to the 43 hunt clubs; it did not make a material contribution to their financing. Running costs from RSCs were financed from dog taxes and membership fees. The Chief Directorate also made a negligent contribution in this regard. Only R80 000 was budgeted for subsidies in the 1988/89 financial year. The Function Clearing Programme recommended that subsidies should be stopped.
4. Regarding the breeding and training of hunt hounds the view was that Government was in direct competition with the private sector and, given the small contribution made already by the Chief Directorate, it was recommended this function should be stopped. A similar recommendation was made regarding the buying and resale of cyanide cartridges and baits.
5. Regarding the training of hunters, it should be mentioned that was still a lack of knowledge in the private sector. A rise in private problem animal controllers, who were not

[291] File WK 40/3, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[292] File P 8/24-27 Ministry of Environmental affairs and Water Affairs, Pretoria.
[293] File ADM 2/2/8 Administrator of the Transvaal, Pretoria.
[294] File BA 2/2/4/1 General Provincial Services Branch, Directorate Management Advisory Services, Provincial Administration of the Cape of Good Hope (Inquiries M. Smit).
[295] "*Funksieverrekeningsprogram*"

Version 5.0 – HD de Waal – Version 5.0

associated with any hunt clubs, was a new phenomenon. Therefore, it was recommended to phase this function out over a period of five years, in favour of these problem controllers and allow hunt clubs to make their own arrangements in this regard.

6. A National Professional Hunt Committee[296], comprising the Provincial Administrations and the Professional Hunters Association of South Africa, was established to arrange training of hunters and control the testing and licencing of professional hunters. At the first meeting of the National Professional Hunt Committee on 29 March 1990, five hunt schools were already registered and it was envisaged that private problem animal controllers would also get on board.

7. Further to the above, a NPAPC was recently established with among other representation by the following organisations: NWGA, RPO, National Game Organisation, RSCs, South African Parks Board, and an MEC and an official of the Component Nature and Environmental Conservation of the Provincial Administrations.

8. In view of the foregoing, your comments would be appreciated regarding the stopping of the Administration's functions of controlling and paying out of subsidies; making hounds, cyanide cartridges and baits available to hunt clubs and providing training to hunt clubs and farmers.

In a letter dated 16 July 1990[297], the Chief Executive Officer: Board of Trade and Industry referred to the letter (File WK 40/2 of 27 June 1990) of Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA), and responded regarding the surcharge on the poison collar.

- The poison collar was grouped with several other items manufactured of leather in the same tariff post in the excise duty and, therefore, it cannot be exempted from the surcharge, which was 15% for collars.
- The government was acutely aware of the detrimental consequences caused by the surcharge; therefore, the surcharge was reduced by on third during March 1990. The Minister of Finance also indicated in the 1990 budget speech government's intent to phase surcharge out in due course.
- The Board expressed its regret for not being able to be of assistance at that stage.

In a letter dated 17 July 1990[298], the Head: Administrator's Services acknowledged on behalf of the Administrator, Mr. Kobus Meiring, receipt of Mr. Theuns Botha's (Secretary: NPAPC) letter (File WK 40 of 2 July 1990) and attachment.

In a letter dated 17 July 1990[299], Mr. R.L. Botha (Private Secretary to the Administrator, Mr. L.J. Botha) acknowledged on his behalf receipt of Mr. Theuns Botha's (Secretary: NPAPC) letter (File WK 40 of 2 July 1990) and attachment. The Administrator noted the content and a letter would be forthcoming.

In a letter dated 24 July 1990[300] to Mr. J.A. de Lange[301], Mr. Theuns Botha (Secretary: NPAPC) referred to their telephone conversation earlier that morning and provided detail on the discussions regarding problem animals, foothold traps and poison:

1. The NPAPC was recently established with its Chairman Mr. P.E. Kingwill; it comprised representatives from among others the wool, meat and game industries, the RSCs of the Cape

[296] "*Nasionale Beroepsjagskomitee (NABKOM)*"
[297] File T 5/1/16 Board of Trade and Industry, Pretoria (Inquiries F.H. Vermaak).
[298] File Adm 7/3 Administrator of the Province of the Cape of Good Hope, Cape Town.
[299] File Adm 21/5/4 Office of the Administrator Orange Free State, Bloemfontein.
[300] File 8/6/Die/2/(WD) Department of Justice, Pretoria (inquiries H. Krüger).
[301] Editor's Note: Ostensibly he was from the Department of Justice and the conversation was linked to a letter, dated 10 April 1990, received in this regard from the Director General: Justice.

Version 5.0 HO de Waal - Version 5.0

Province, Oranjejag, Transvaal Federal Problem Animal control Association, the four province's Division Nature Conservation and the MEC's responsible for environmental affairs.
2. A copy of the press release, reflecting on the Committee's objectives, was attached.
3. The four Provincial Administrators as well as the Minister of Agriculture were informed about the Committee and its activities.
4. Although the Committee had no executive authority, it acted in a policymaking and advisory capacity manner. It endeavoured to improve communication (and understanding) between farmers who were faced by problem animals and applying methods to control them on the one hand, and on the other hand the Divisions Nature Conservation whose task it was to ensure that the ecology was not disturbed, but improved for mutual benefit.
5. This Committee acted with the highest degree of responsibility and may be regarded as authoritative and with whom organisations such as "*Animal Anti-Cruelty League*" and the Department may liaise regarding specific aspects requiring greater clarity.
6. The committee also held the view that there should be specific codes to regulate substances and methods used to control problem animals and welcomed the input of any institution who can contribute to solve the problem.
7. It was emphasised that no alternative method for foothold traps to catch problem animals have been developed to control these animals as effectively. Therefore, if we want to maintain wool sheep farming in this country, foothold traps and poison must be used judiciously until an alternative has been found.
8. To control problem animals effectively and ensure the problem did not get out of control, foothold traps would have to be used to some extent. It must be emphasised that if problem animals should get have control, there would be thousands more sheep suffering seriously when mauled by problem animals.
9. It was understood that restrictive legislation were imposed in some states of the USA regarding the use of certain methods to catch animals and caused small livestock farming to stop altogether. Therefore, if similar restrictive legislation were imposed in South Africa it would create a huge storm in the small livestock industry and in some parts of the country, which depend on wool sheep farming it, would become very impossible.
10. It was suggested the Department contacted Mr. Peter Schneekluth, one of the most well-known hunters in the country and who was very proficient with foothold traps.
11. Regarding the use of poison in the poison collars, it was suggested the Department should contact Mr. Jeff Dyer, Worcester and Mr. Bill Cullen of Agrihold, Pretoria or Mr. Orban the Registrar of Poisons, Pretoria.
12. The names and contact detail of persons serving on the NPAPC were also provided.
13. It the Department needed more assistance they could contact Committee again.

In a letter dated 25 July 1990[302], Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) informed Mr. D.J. Visser (General Manager: Production, SA Wool Board) about a recommendation taken by the NPAPC regarding training courses on problem animals at agricultural colleges. At its recent meeting, it was suggested to investigate the possibility of including this issue in the curriculum of the colleges. The Divisions Nature Conservation of the provinces indicated they would assist in compiling such courses. Mr. Kingwill requested that the item be included on the agenda for the forthcoming meeting of the Wool Production Committee where he would provide more motivation.

Mr. Theuns Botha (Secretary: NPAPC) received a letter on 25 July 1990[303] from Mr. A.P. Louw, Secretary: Kraankuil Farmers' Association, Kraankuilstasie, Hopetown. They have many problems with vermin. They have tried various methods and courses have been presented but

[302] File WK 40/3, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[303] File WK 40/3, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

they were not successful in exterminating the vermin. Jeff Dyer presented a course and demonstrated to set foothold traps and use the poison collar but farmers have very little success. The Kraankuil Farmers' Association would like to see control of vermin implemented over a larger area by a large organisation such as for example the RSC or agricultural organisation. They knew vermin were not the responsibility of an individual farmer, therefore they requested assistance and were they considering something such as Oranjejag to control vermin in a coordinated manner. Cooperation would be appreciated.

On 27 July 1990[304] Mr. Theuns Botha (Secretary: NPAPC) acknowledged receipt of the letter by Mr. A.P. Louw, Secretary: Kraankuil Farmers' Association, Kraankuilstasie, Hopetown. The content was noted and the matter referred to the NPAPC for further attention.

Mr. Theuns Botha (Secretary: NPAPC) received a letter on 27 July 1990[305] from Mr. G.J. du Toit, Uitspankop, Brandvlei. Mr. du Toit referred to an article in the Landbouweekblad and said he was setting poison ejectors and foothold traps for black-backed jackals. Reasonable results were achieved with foothold traps, but with poison ejectors, the results were poor. He inquired about a few recipes to make baits. He used some baits of Mr. Schneekluth but without success. Maybe there were some proven baits, which he could obtain?

In a letter dated 27 July 1990[306] Mr. Theuns Botha (Secretary: NPAPC) forwarded the letter received from Mr. G.J. du Toit, Uitspankop, Brandvlei to Mr. C.L. Greyling (the Federal Problem Animal Control Association of Transvaal in Wakkerstroom) for assistance.

Mr. Theuns Botha (Secretary: NPAPC) responded on 27 July 1990[307] to Mr. G.J. du Toit, Uitspankop, Brandvlei. The content of his letter was noted and the letter was forwarded to Mr. C.L. Greyling of the Federal Problem Animal Control Association of Transvaal in Wakkerstroom, who may be able to assist.

In a letter dated 10 August 1990[308], Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) reminded Mr. Peter Schneekluth (Prins Albert) that he was still R150 in arrears for being afforded exhibition space in the foyer of the Elizabeth hotel during the Cape Province NWGA' Congress (30 January to 1 February 1990).

In an undated letter[309], Mr. Peter Schneekluth (Wildlife Damage Control, Prins Albert) referred to Mr. Theuns Botha's (Manager: NWGA) letter of 10 August 1990). He did try to make the payment on 31 January but could not find the appropriate person, but expected to receive an invoice. He requested to be kept informed regarding the decisions, plans and actions of the NWGA's Vermin Committee. He was also considering to exhibit again and to advertise. He requested more information on these aspects.

In a letter dated 12 August 1990[310], Mr. D. le Grange (Secretary: Prins Albert Farmers' Association) informed Mr. Theuns Botha (Secretary: NPAPC) about the problems encountered in the Association's area from problem animals. He inquired how the Association could be of assistance. They would also appreciate information on the progress with regard to policy changes.

[304] File WK 40/3, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[305] File WK 40/3, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[306] File WK 40/3, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[307] File WK 40/3, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[308] File WK 40/3, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[309] File WK 40/3, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[310] File WK 40/3, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.

Version 5.0 - HD de Waal, Version 5.0

In a letter dated 20 August 1990[311], Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) thanked Mr. D. le Grange (Secretary: Prins Albert Farmers' Association) for offering their assistance regarding problem animals. A copy of the recent minutes and a press release were attached. It was emphasised that the control of problem animals was also a headache for the NWGA, but it was accepted as a reality and the problem would not be solved overnight. The NWGA endeavoured to find solutions and was tackling it in a coordinated manner.

In a letter dated 20 August 1990[312], Mr. L.J. Botha, the Administrator: Orange Free State referred to Mr. Theuns Botha's (Manager: NWGA) letter (File WK 40 of 2 July 1990) and the Administration's letter (21/5/4 of 17 July 1990).

- The content of the letter was noted and the Administration was confident the Problem Animal Policy Committee had the potential to formulate solutions that were necessary to control the national plague.
- Regarding the financial responsibility referred to, the Administration would endeavour to contribute, subject to financial constraints to which it were subjected. Furthermore, an in depth consideration regarding policy statements three and four were requested.
- The Secretary and NPAPC were wished the necessary strength for their important but difficult task.

In an undated letter received on 6 September 1990 by the NWGA[313], Mr. F.B. Claassen (Secretary: Namaqualand Rural Council, Springbok) referred to the telephone conversation on 30 August 1990 between Mr. von Molendorff and Mr. Theuns Botha (Secretary: NPAPC). The Council was established at the beginning of 1990 to represent the local community on the Namaqualand RSC. Problem animal control was a very important issue for the area and discussions were held regularly at meetings of the Council. They inquired how they could possibly provide input to the Committee and would appreciate feedback on its activities. Furthermore, with reference to the unique character of the region, it was inquired about the possibility of appointing a representative from the region on the Committee. They were looking forward to feedback in due course.

In a letter dated 10 September 1990[314], Mr. Peter Schneekluth (Wildlife Damage Control, Prins Albert) wrote to Mr. Theuns Botha (Secretary: NPAPC):

> "*I read with interest your article: 'Focus on Problem Animals' in Golden Fleece, August 1990.*
>
> *I was impressed by Mr. Kingwill's realistic appraisal on problem animal control research (P.A.C.R.). It was rather unflattering but nevertheless justified.*
>
> *Has it ever been established how many millions of rand have been spent on P.A.C.R. the last 25 years and with what results? This aspect of P.A.C.R. would be worth researching. Nevertheless it must be acknowledged that a wealth of interesting facts on the general ecology of jackal and lynx and other problem animals has been brought to light in the process. But unfortunately this is only of little help in efficiently controlling the wily jackal that roams the country from Cape Town to Messina and from Durban to Walvisbay*
>
> *And yet indirectly P.A.C.R. may have found something of value. By virtue of its very fruitlessness it has proven one thing, namely: that there will never be a quick solution nor a method that works like a dream and is also cheap.*
>
> *Many farmers, hunters and officials have known that for a long time.*

[311] File WK 40/3, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[312] File Adm 21/5/4 Office of the Administrator Orange Free State, Bloemfontein.
[313] File AL 6/2 Namakwaland Landelike Raad.
[314] File WK 40/3, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.

Version 5.0 – HO de Waal – Version 5.0

On the other hand it is encouraging to know that there are quite a few farmers who have come to terms with their predator problems. These farmers acquired suitable knowledge in modern control techniques. Spent some money on sufficient and decent control equipment and then applied knowledge and equipment with lots of determination. This is a deadly technique which yield lots of dead predators. It is worth trying.

For your information: I enclose some literature[315] on problem animal control."

In a letter dated 26 September 1990[316], Mrs. Esther Brand (Director: Oranjejag) sought assistance from Mr. Theuns Botha (Secretary: NPAPC). At a recent Regional Annual Meeting of Oranjejag, a proposal was adopted: "*Inquire whether the amount of R129 250, which was equivalent to 0.05% of the total wool yield in the Orange Free State, could be transferred to Oranjejag for the proper control of problem animals in the Free State*." She requested the assistance of the Committee in that regard.

In a letter dated 16 October 1990[317], Dr. A.E. (Tony) Bowland (Cheetah Project, Kruger National Park, Skukuza) contacted Mr. Kingwill [Chairman: NPAPC]:

"*It is with interest that I read about the formation of a 'Problem Animal Policy Committee'. My interest in the matter stems from research conducted on jackal and caracal in 1989 while I was still at the University of Natal. The results of my research will be made known shortly in the form of a handy booklet (fits into a bakkie glovebox) which John Fair of Harrismith is helping me to publish.*

Many farmers have a very emotive and unreasonable attitude towards problem animals and can only see research in terms of developing effective methods of extermination. Notwithstanding more than 150 years of attempted elimination problem animals are actually increasing their range, an indication that this approach is foolhardy. However, current generation and well-informed farmers have a more realistic approach in that they are prepared to consider alternatives to 'uitroei[318]'.

A change in philosophy from farming against nature to farming with nature might well produce some effective results. It is not unrealistic to design farming operations that cater for adequate natural prey populations thereby keeping naturally satiated and residential predators away from domestic stock.

We produced a video which outlined methods of problem animal control. The major criticism of the video was that it lacked technical detail. Further, in a survey of farmers the production of a handbook on predator control gained top priority of a list of six research objectives (questionnaire[319] attached). It is evident that many farmers are

[315] Editor's Note: attached to the letter were pamphlets "Peter's Probleemdierbeheer/Wildlife Damage Control, Inligting/Information", No's 1, 2 & 3, a comprehensive product price list and a Certificate of Attendance.
[316] File WK 40/3, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[317] File WK 40/3, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[318] Editor's Note: = "exterminate".
[319] Questionnaire - Question 8: Please tick the following research objectives in order of importance (**1** = most important, **6** = least important:

Rank	
3	A predator identification guide showing killing and feeding patterns, hair, spoor, distinctive mannerisms, etc.
5	The development of scent and sounds attractants/lures.
4	An investigation of movement patterns, home ranges, population densities, and reactions of predators to different control methods.
6	Isolating those factors of stock, farms, and habitat management that makes some areas (farms) more attractive to predators than others
2	Improved hunting and trapping techniques.
1	Production of a comprehensive handbook on predator control which includes detailed information on: (a) The ecology of jackal and caracal; (b) Scent and sound attractants; (c) Hunting and trapping methods; (d) Toxic collars and coyote getters; (e) Night shooting and dog packs; (f) Electric fencing; and (g) Predator identification guide (killing,& feeding patterns, hair tufts etc.).

prepared to tackle their predation problem themselves but are lacking detailed information. The production of a handbook, which I am prepared to do, would be a positive move towards solving the problem of predators on farmland.

I wish the Problem Animal policy committee productivity and success in its endeavours and trust that it will strive to move beyond the current traditional and unsuccessful approach to problem animal control."

In a fax, dated 19 October 1990[320], Mr. D.J. Cook (Deputy Director: West, Natal Parks Board) referred to a telecon that morning with Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA); attached was a very important 4-page draft document:

"DRAFT PROPOSAL FOR A NATIONAL PROBLEM ANIMAL CONTROL STRATEGY RELATING TO THE SMALL LIVESTOCK FARMER IN R.S.A.

(Compiled by D.J. Cook)[321]

COMMUNICATION

1. National Level:

National Wool Growers; Assoc. to:-

(a) Co-ordinate activities of Provincial forums, facilitate research and funding, and establish communication, involving:
- *Provincial authorities*
- *Target/Interest Groups*
- *Control experts*
- *Nature conservation*
- *Farmers: S.A. Agricultural Union, Provincial Agricultural Unions. Provincial Wool Growers' Assoc. s*
- *Research groups.*

(b) Promote biologically acceptable control of problem animals through the media, so that a sound image is developed.

(c) Promote co-operation and gain support from strategic decision makers:
- *Government*
- *Animal Protection Groups*
- *Dept. of Justice*
- *Agricultural lobby etc.*

(d) Publish training manual based on research findings.

2. Provincial level:

Provincial Committees (Problem Animal Co-ordinating Committee) need to:-

(a) Promote Wool growers/Natal Parks Board liaison & co-operation as the foundation of communication.

(b) Market acceptance of co-operation through selected media aimed at the small stock farmer, i.e.:
- *NAULU*
- *Farmers' Weekly*
- *Landbouweekblad*
- *Conservancy Assoc. Newsletter*
- *Magnum*
- *Farmers' Forum (TV programme)*

(c) Promote hunt clubs on Regional basis that use the full range of control techniques.

3. Natal Parks Board:

Extension staff need to:-

[320] File WK 40/3, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.

[321] Editor's Note: originating from Natal, this very preliminary daft clearly still lacked broader inclusion of the other Provinces and institutions.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

(a) Promote local forums so that they act as communications 'link' between farmers and the Provincial committee, and for disseminating information to farmers.
(b) Collect statistics.
(c) Provide and advisory service to farmers on biologically acceptable control of problem animals.
(d) Disseminate information through:-
- *Local forums*
- *Agricultural Shows*
- *Meetings*
- *Conservancies*
- *Personal contact with individual farmers.*

CONTROL

1. National level:

National Wool Growers' Assoc. to:-

(a) REACTIVE – Ascertain and promote the full range of biologically acceptable control techniques:
- *Hunt packs*
- *Gintraps*
- *Cage traps*
- *Coyote-getters*
- *Toxic collars*
- *Poison (strychnine only registered poison for baits)*
- *Snares*
- *Sport hunters*

(b) PROACTIVE – ascertain and promote:
- *Sheep protection (shepherds)*
- *Electric fencing*
- *Animal husbandry techniques*

(c) Ascertain and promote realistic acceptance of a given % level of loss to predators as is the case with disease, abortion etc.

(d) Establish reliable suppliers of predator control equipment and materials:
- *Lures*
- *Gintraps*
- *Cage traps*
- *Toxic collars*
- *Poison baits (strychnine pills)*

(e) Initiate Legislation at national level that enables the Provinces to tailor legislation for their specific needs regarding application of control needs.

2. Provincial level:

Provincial Committees (Problem Animal Co-ordinating Committee) need to:-

(a) Promote and establish 'Hunt Clubs' that use full range of control techniques. Farmers co-operate and employ staff & equipment using existing Ord 14 of 1974.

(b) Provide competency training for farmers in the use of poison, either coyote-getters or pill form of strychnine through private consultants in accordance with Provincial Ordinances.

3. Natal Parks Board:

Extension staff to:-

(a) Offer an advisory service only, and not to undertake any actual control of predators.

(b) Enforce a permit system for laying of poison for problem animals, and develop procedure that is acceptable to all interest groups.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

TRAINING

1. National level:

National Wool Growers' Assoc. to:-

(a) Develop a National register of experts available in predator control and their various areas of competence, and identify experts qualified to issue competency certificates in the use of poison.

(b) Evaluate and research effectiveness of various control methods for inclusion in training courses.

(c) Investigate the introduction of training modules in Agricultural colleges, Universities, and agricultural schools on control of problem animals.

2. Provincial levels:

Provincial Committees (Problem Animal Co-ordinating Committee) need to:-

(a) Annually develop training programmes for Hunt Clubs in Natal and for groups of farmers or their staff, using private experts.

(b) Be responsible for issuing competency certificates for farmers in the use of poison, either coyote-getters or pill form of strychnine, based on results of training by a certified expert.

3. Natal Parks Board:

Natal Parks Board to:-

(a) Participate in training courses as arranged by the Problem Animal Co-ordinating Committee, so that an efficient advisory service to farmers is provided.

RESEARCH

1. National level:

National Wool Growers' Assoc. to:-

(a) Co-ordinate and determine research needs (via inter-Provincial problem Animal Research Committee?).

(b) Establish funds for identified research.

(c) Disseminate research findings to Provincial committees.

2. Provincial level:

Provincial Committees (Problem Animal Co-ordinating Committee) need to:-

(a) Provide National Wool Growers' Assoc. with recommendations for research based on local needs.

(b) Disseminate research findings and training manuals to all regional interest groups

3. Natal Parks Board:-

Natal Parks Board to:-

(a) Provide Problem animal Co-ordinating Committee with recommendations for research.

(b) Assist the Provincial Committee to disseminate research findings to farmers."

In a letter dated 29 October 1990[322], the Chief Directorate Nature and Environmental Conservation, CPA informed Mr. Theuns Botha (Secretary: NPAPC) that in future it would be represented by Mr. J.E. Lensing on the NPAPC and no longer by Mr. J.D. Wyk. Attached was the questionnaire for the meeting of 15 November 1990.

In a letter dated 11 November 1990[323], Mr. G.M. Schutte (Assistant Manager: RPO) informed the Chairman of the NPAPC about specific aspects regarding problem animal control:

[322] File ANO 7/3 General Provincial Services Branch, Chief Directorate Nature and Environmental Conservation, Provincial Administration of the Cape of Good Hope.

[323] File 14/1/8 Red Meat Producers' Organisation, Pretoria.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

- On 20 September 1990, the Small Livestock Management of the RPO noted the press release regarding the first meeting of the NPAPC and where consensus was reached on certain policy aspects.
- The Management also noted the letter of the Cape provincial authority where it indicated intent to stop its involvement with problem animal control.
- After further deliberation, the Management decided: (a) accepted the small livestock industry was responsible for problem animal control and would increasing have to apply the control itself; (b) the NPAPC be informed about the Small Livestock Management's view, namely that the provincial authorities still had a responsibility, specifically regarding financial aspects of problem animal control; (c) the NPAPC was requested to clarify the aspect referred to previously, as well as the role of RSCs and provide feedback to the Small Livestock Management; (d) also inform the NPAPC about the Small Livestock Management view that training and expertise in own ranks was very important, as well to investigate the desirability of having the professional hunters organisations also represented on the NPAPC.
- It would be appreciated if these decisions were conveyed to the NPAPC.

The NPAPC met at 10h00 on Monday 15 November 1990[324] in the Committee Room, H.F. Verwoerd Building, PAO, St Andrew Street, Bloemfontein. The meeting was attended by: Mr. P.E. Kingwill (Chairman), Mr. P.J.S. Olivier (MEC: PAO), Dr. G.F. Barkhuizen (PAO), Messrs. N. Ferreira (PAO), W. Jansen (PAO), Mr. J.E. Lensing (CPA), G.P. Visagie (TPA), P.J.J. van Rensburg (TPA), B.R. Wilkinson (NPA), D.J. Cook (Natal Parks Board), G. Nel (Oranjejag), T.F. Roux (Oranjejag), C.L. Greyling (Federal Problem Animal Control Association), M. van der Merwe (Federal Problem Animal Control Association), J.L. van der Walt (RPO), P.F. Hugo (RSC), A.P. Pretorius (NWGA of SA), W.J. Wessels (NWGA of SA), T.F.J. Botha (Secretary), P.S. Buys and Miss. C. van der Westhuizen (NWGA of SA). Excerpts from the minutes are cited:

- Welcoming and apologies: The Chairman welcomed all. Apologies were offered for Messrs. P. Miller (MEC), G.D. Laws, G. du Plessis and J. le R. Pieterse.
- Approving the Minutes: The minutes of the meeting of 30 April 1990 was approved; moved by Mr. A.P. Pretorius and seconded by Mr. C.J. Greyling.
- Literature study – research: It was left to the representatives of the division's nature conservation serving on the interprovincial problem animal research committee to compile a document for the meeting regarding further research, which was needed by the provinces.
- Evaluation was needed regarding: (a) water resistant lures, (b) vagrant dogs, (c) calling devices, (d) poison as substitute for 1080, (e) after action of existing poisons.
- Priority determination
- Cost estimates
- Recommendation regarding funding of projects
- Several documents were provided to the meeting. However, because members did not have sufficient opportunity to study it, the issue was referred to the next meeting of the Policy Committee. **Action**: Secretary
- Communication: Mr. D.J. Cook presented a slideshow to indicate with a draft strategic plan how communication and responsibility guidelines regarding problem animals could be implemented.
- The Chairman thanked him. The asked the meeting to make their views known on the basic concept. He also said that some of the principles emphasised by Mr. Cook was at the executive level, while the Committee was only an advisory body.

[324] File WK 40/3, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.

Version 5.0 – Do not cite without permission

- After discussion, the meeting was satisfied that sufficient structures existed at the provincial level, although it differs between provinces, to ensure information was disseminated upwards and downwards.
- The Secretary was requested to obtain a list of the problem animal manuals that were available at the provinces and disseminate it as wide as possible to the media so that farmers who are interested may order it.
- The provinces would assume responsibility for disseminating the literature.
- The respective provincial nature conservation institutions were requested to distribute the manuals they possess to the other members of the Committee before the next meeting. This would enable them to study the content and be able to make more meaningful at that meeting. **Action**: Messrs. Cook, Lensing, Visagie, Dr. Barkhuizen
- Control: After discussion, it was decided that before the next meeting, the Interprovincial Problem Animal Research Committee and other institutions should provide proposals to the Committee regarding the most effective control methods for the Problem Animal Policy Committee to add its approval and make these acceptable methods available to the media. **Action**: Mr. Visagie
- The intention was for the committee to approve scientifically acceptable control methods.
- The Committee took a policy decision, namely whichever control methods were used it should be applied humanely. Although problem animals caused huge financial losses, the Committee was concerned about the suffering of animals and was in support of using the most humane control methods. Therefore, it endeavoured for the expert use of control measures, which was possible with appropriate training, and the correct use of the equipment.
- The Committee decided that existing text books/manuals should first be revised and where possible a chapter included explaining the dangers of using equipment or poisons incorrectly, which would cause suffering of animals exposed to such control methods. After this part was included in text books/manuals, it could be made available to the media. **Action**: Divisions Nature Conservation
- 1080: The research and control of poisons did not reside with provinces. The Department of Health determined what may or may not be used. Provinces did not have appropriate laboratories to develop a new poison.
- Oranjejag objected to the use of any poison. Specific codes of use exist in the Cape Province and the injudicious use of poison was strongly opposed. The Province was not opposed to the development of new poisons. The representative of Transvaal said he was not authorised to express an opinion and should first consult before he can state an official viewpoint. Natal was in favour of developing new poisons provided the method of application was well controlled and would not be detrimental to animals that did not cause a problem or the environment. When poison was used in Transvaal the method, where it was hidden under soil provided the best results because it was picked up by the black-backed jackal and not by birds. Strychnine had the disadvantage that it was very stable. It would be desirable to develop a poison that was not very stable. Poison lines should be inspected regularly as a control measure.
- It was suggested that AFCASA be approached to develop a new poison.
- The meeting reached consensus that the judicious use of poison not be excluded as an effective control method. The use was sufficiently described in the existing Ordinances and manuals. The meeting supported the principle to approach an institution(s) for further possible research on alternative poisons that were ecologically friendly and could possibly serve as substitute for 1080. The poison PDB 1 was already registered. It was used in the poison collar but it was an existing poison and it was not desirable to use it as a substitute.

Version 5.0 - HQ archival version

- The Secretary was requested to approach the CSIR to inquire if they would be interested to develop a new poison, and if they can to indicate what the cost would be for such a development. **Action**: Secretary
- Training:
- It was decided that it would be desirable to compile a register of all institutions involved with problem animal control and that the Policy Committee should set specific norms for institutions to comply with to receive "National Registration." The institutions could then be used to provide training. **Action**: Secretary
- The provinces could meet to lay down standards. Transvaal did not have the human resources to provide training. The Cape Province provided training and it staff could present the training. The staff in the Free State could present training but lacked funding to present the courses. The methods should be marketed because it attracted candidates. It must be indicated what the results of the training were. Natal also had staff to present courses. However, farmers did not support the courses.
- The meeting decided farmers should be informed through the media what type of training courses were available and where to apply. Farmers must be made aware it was their responsibility to obtain training. After the action was launched, it would be determined from the response what else needed to be done. The provinces with the necessary human resources should notify the Secretary so that he could distribute the information. However, the Interprovincial Research Committee should first meet and ascertain that sufficient attention was indeed given by the courses to nature friendly control methods. In the meantime, courses that complied could be marketed. **Action**: Divisions Nature Conservation and Secretary
- Manual: The manual, which was provided by the Free State, was accepted with thanks and the members were requested to provide any comments within two months directly to Dr. G.F. Barkhuizen. **Action**: All representatives
- Training Agricultural Colleges: The Wool Production Committee of the Wool Board would contact the Agricultural colleges to determine whether if it was possible to include problem animal training in their curricula. Reaction would be awaited and if they needed such courses the Divisions: Nature Conservation would be approached to compile a curriculum. At the Grootfontein Agricultural College, the Division Nature Conservation of the CPA already presented a weeklong nature conservation course and problem animal control formed part of the course. **Action**: Refer to next meeting
- Articles on problem animals: The request was repeated to make scientific articles available to the Secretary. The articles would be send to the media for publication under the name of the author. In the Cape Province, there was a division in the Administration who specialised in preparing such information for the media. It was requested that the information also be made available for distribution to the editorial boards of the Golden Fleece and the Red Meat.

  Action: All representatives of the Divisions Nature Conservation as well as Mr. Lensing regarding the distribution of media articles to Red Meat and the Golden Fleece
- Press release: The press release by the Chairman of the Problem Animal Policy Committee was noted with thanks. **Action**: None
- Notice: The reaction received from the Administrators were noted regarding the letters to inform them on the activities of the Committee. **Action**: None
- Abolishing the surcharge on poison collars: The Committee accept the answer received from the Council on Trade and Industry, namely that the surcharge could not be reduced any more. **Action**: None
- Use of foothold traps: The meeting noted the letter that the Secretary addressed to the Department of Justice regarding the use judicious of foothold traps. The meeting held the view that more requests regarding abuses in the control of problem animals could be expected in future. **Action**: None

Version 5.0 - Hoede Weer - Version 5.0

- Fencing Act: Mr. J.L. van der Walt did not receive more reactions from the Northern Cape and requested that it be removed from the agenda. **Action**: None
- Letter - Oranjejag: The meeting deliberated the written request by Oranjejag that part of the wool levy be used to control problem animals in the Free State.
- Mr. W.J. Wessels requested that the word "wool levy" be substituted by "meat levy."
- The meeting's view was that training was the only merit for which the use of such levies could be justified. If such a request was made at a congress, it should be clearly spelled out what training was envisaged and what benefits farmers would stand to gain.
- After further deliberation, it was decided the Policy Committee could not express a view regarding the principle to use levy money for training, and that the issue could be tested at the respective RPO and NGWA congresses to determine the view of producers.

Action: NWGA/RPO

- Letter – Namaqualand Rural Council: The meeting did not support the request to serve on the Policy Committee because the RSC already represented them.

Action: Letter Secretary

- Correspondence: (1) Peter Schneekluth - noted, (2) Prins Albert, (3) Kraankuil Farmers' Association, (4) G.J. du Toit, (5) J.J. du Plessis; (6) Hanover Farmers' Association.
- Mr. Lensing undertook to write to each person and inform him or her about existing courses. Similar letters received in future should be referred to the respective provincial administrations. **Action**: Mr. Lensing
- Letter General Provincial Services: Directorate Management Services: The meeting discussed the letter, which indicated that spending by government on problem animal control would be decreased.
- The RPO has responded to the letter.
- Mr. Lensing said the letter was not correct. A function clearing study was conducted [Cape Province] and it was decided not to subsidise private hunt clubs anymore because it [control of predators] was considered part of the production process [livestock] and in the process of privatisation, was not consider government's responsibility to finance production processes. For the same reason the hunt hound breeding stations were closed. Training will be continued because it was a link to make farmers more nature conscious. Provinces also do not want to block private initiative. He said paragraph 6 in the letter was not correct. The RPO responded well to the letter. The Committee reconfirmed that regarding training and retention of basic organisational structures, government (provinces) and the RSCs should continue to provide essential contributions.
- In response to question regarding the future involvement of RSCs, Mr. Lensing said in the Cape Province the functions of Divisional Councils were transferred to the RSCs. At that stage, this arrangement only applied to the Cape Province.
- After further deliberation, it was decided to ascribe to the original viewpoint regarding the involvement of government as stated in the official press release.
- Regarding the inclusion of the professional hunters' organisation in the Problem Animal Policy Committee, it was decided no justification existed to invite them. **Action**: Secretary
- Assignments: Mr. D.J. Cook was requested to adapt the draft plan, which he compiled for the meeting to indicate who was responsible for the respective functions. He could use the minutes as reference source. The document must be submitted to the next meeting.
- Date and venue for the next meeting:
- The next meeting was scheduled at Jan Smuts Airport on Thursday, 25 April 1991 at 10h00. Arrangements should be made to hold the meeting in the airport building.
- The Chairman thanked the PAO for making their facilities available.
- The meeting was adjourned at 16h00.

Version 5.0 - H de Waal - Version 5.0

In a letter dated 10 December 1990[325] to Mr. Theuns Botha (Secretary: NPAPC), Mr. J.W.S. Helm (Secretary: Albertinia Problem Animal Hunt Club) referred to the NWGA's news item of 3 July 1990 and the invitation to communicate problems to the Committee:

- In the past, the Hunt Club's funds were based on an amount/ha and collected on their behalf by the Divisional Council.
- That caused many problems and landowners objected because (a) many farmed with cattle and did not experience damage by problem animals, (b) many small livestock farmers also did not experience problems from vermin but still had to pay the levies, and (c) a large property in the district belonged to "*Kernkor*", they did not pay the levies but served as a breeding area for problem animals.
- In spite of those and other objections, the Hunt Club received sufficient money to continue meeting their obligations.
- After the Divisional Council could no longer collect the membership fees for the Hunt Club, they applied to the RSC to collect the levies, but it was declined.
- They could no longer obtain funds and therefore were inquiring with the Policy Committee if it was possible for one of the branches of the wool or small livestock industries to assist or advise on the collection of funds.
- Thus far, they managed to control the problem animals as mentioned in the news item, but when their funds were depleted, they would be unable to continue with their task.
- They would appreciate it if the Policy Committee could attend to the problems described in the letter.

In a letter dated 12 December 1990[326], Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA of SA) wrote to the Secretary: Problem Animal Policy Committee): At the meeting of the NWGA's Central Management it was mentioned that the arrangement to pay dog taxes over to hunt clubs was stopped. It was also mentioned that if there was not a registered hunter at a club, it did not qualify for any funding and that money was paid directly to the RSC. The Policy Committee was requested to investigate the merit of the case.

Mr. Theuns Botha (Secretary: NPAPC) issued a circular, dated 13 December 1990[327] to the Members of the NPAPC:

- Attached was a draft copy of the minutes (meeting of 15 November 1990). They were requested to provide suggestions for any changes to finalise the minutes by 25 January 1991. Due to a malfunctioning tape recorder, recording of the first 45 minutes were lost.
- <u>Everybody</u> should attend to the following joint actions:

1. <u>Manual: Free State</u>: The draft manual that Dr. G.F. Barkhuizen distributed at the meeting should be perused and feedback provided within 2 months directly to him [postal address].
2. <u>Communication:</u> The respective Divisions: Nature Conservation would post the existing manuals in due course to all members. Everybody should study the content to provide meaningful input at the next meeting.
3. Specific actions for the <u>respective members</u> were:

<u>Messrs. Cook, Lensing, Visagie and Dr. Barkhuizen</u>

(a) Provide the Secretary with a source list of problem animal manuals available at each province before 25 January 1991; the Secretary would provide the list to the media.

(b) Copies of the manuals should also be posted to the other members so that they can read it before the next meeting. Addresses of members were included in the annexure.

[325] File WK 40/3, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[326] File WK 40/3, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[327] File WK 40/3, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.

Version 5.0 - HO de Vival - Version 5.0

(c) Inspect the list existing literature and where necessary include a chapter on the dangers involved when equipment or poison were applied incorrectly which may cause suffering to animals subjected to these procedures (deadline: 25 January 1991).
(d) For those provinces with training courses, provide the Secretary with a list of such courses (preferably with dates) for distribution to the media. This list should emanate from the Problem Animal Research Committee after having evaluated whether the courses were emphasising nature friendly control methods sufficiently. If a course, or courses, were deemed to comply already, the Secretary could be informed and he would distribute it to the media.
(e) If any potential articles were available which would be of interest to the ordinary farmer, these could be provided to the media or alternative submit it to the Secretary for further dissemination to the media.

Mr. Visagie

(a) The Problem Animal Research Committee should make recommendations to the NPAPC regarding the most effective control methods for approval by the latter, before it was also disseminated to the media (deadline: 28 March 1991).

Mr. Lensing

(a) The Division in the CPA involved with editing of scientific articles should be brought in contact with the Editors of the Golden Fleece [postal address] and the Red Meat [postal address] in order to consider articles for publication.
(b) Write the letters as detailed in the annexure to the agenda of 15 November 1990 (See points 7.2 to 7.6 under Correspondence).

Mr. Cook

(a) The meeting requested and adaption of the draft strategic plan, which was submitted at the meeting with input, made during the meeting. The document should be submitted to the next meeting (deadline: Thursday 28 March 1991).
(b) The meeting requested that a register be compiled of all institutions involved with problem animal control and to draft a code to which all institutions must comply to be eligible for "National Registration."

- If any aspects were not clear, the Secretary should only be contacted after 3 January 1991.

In a letter dated 13 December 1990[328], Mr. Theuns Botha (Secretary: NPAPC) informed Mr. J.L. van der Walt (Manager: RPO) that the RPO Small Livestock Committee's recent request to allow the Professional Hunters Association representation on the Policy Committee, was not granted.

In a letter dated 13 December 1990[329], Mr. Theuns Botha (Secretary: NPAPC) reminded Mr. J.L. van der Walt (Manager: RPO) about the following:

- With reference to the discussions at the Policy Committee meeting, you are cordially requested to consider at your management meetings or congresses the desirability to use levy money for training on problem animals.
- The Committee could not be prescriptive or indicate the envisaged type of training. This request was received from a producers' association in the Free State and the Policy Committee was of the view the producers' organisation should first address the principle.
- After its meeting in April, and based on the outcome of a detailed prioritisation study, the Policy Committee may be in a position to provide specific proposals for consideration.

[328] File WK 40/3, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[329] File WK 40/3, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

In a letter dated 13 December 1990[330], Mr. Theuns Botha (Secretary: NPAPC) wrote to Mr. D.J. Visser (General Manager: Wool Production, SA Wool Board) about the following:

- It was requested earlier the year that training courses in problem animals at Agricultural Colleges be added to the agenda of the Wool Production Policy Committee.
- Information was received that the Division Nature Conservation of the CPA was presenting a weeklong nature conservation course at the Graaff-Reinet[331] Agricultural College and problem animal control formed part of the course.
- An answer would be appreciated before the next meeting on 25 April 1991.

In two similar letters, dated 13 December 1990[332], Mr. Theuns Botha (Secretary: NPAPC) were written to (i) the Managing Director, AVCASA (Halfway House), and (ii) Dr. A. Paterson (Division Mineral Technology, CSIR, Pretoria) about the possibility to develop an alternative poison as substitute for 1080:

- The NPAPC, comprising representatives of among others the Provincial Administration's Divisions of Nature Conservation, Wool and Meat Industries. Hunt Clubs and RSCs, inquired about the possibility that a division existed at AVCASA [or the CSIR] which would be interested to develop a new poison to use in controlling problem animals, *e.g.* jackals, caracals and vagrant dogs.
- A very effective poison, known as 1080, was removed from the market a few years ago by the Department of Health. Attached were copies of correspondence alluding to the poison. If there was such a division at AVCASA [or the CSIR] that could get involved in such a development, it was also inquired about the costs associated in that regard.
- Similar requests were directed at AVCASA [or the CSIR]. A speedy response was requested to be deliberated and decisions on at next meeting on 25 April 1991.

In a letter dated 13 December 1990[333], Mr. Theuns Botha (Secretary: NPAPC) referred Mr. F.B. Claassen (Namaqualand Rural Council) to his recent letter (AL6/2) and informed him that the request for representation on the Policy Committee, was not granted. The RSCs were represented; therefore, the Rural Councils were already indirectly represented. It was trusted they accepted the decision and where possible they would be kept informed about activities of the Policy Committee. Mr. P.F. Hugo was representing the RSCs and could be contacted directly.

1991

In a letter dated 2 January 1991[334] to Mr. Theuns Botha (Secretary: NPAPC), Mr. Peter Schneekluth (Wildlife Damage Control, Prins Albert) a well-known problem animal specialist alluded to his observations and experience:

"*Re: Problem animal control.*

I have worked on problem animals since 1979. Most of the time as an independent trapper and instructor. I derived my income from farmers who paid for hunting, training and the sale of control equipment

Since 1982 I have given about 150 predator control training courses. There were times when I could not keep abreast with the demand for my services. However, it seems that the demand for my work is gradually drying up

a) Could it possibly be that the predator problem is on the decline?

[330] File WK 40/3, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[331] Editor's Note: it should read the *Grootfontein Agricultural College* – see the Minutes of meeting which was held on 15 November 1990.
[332] File WK 40/3, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[333] File WK 40/3, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[334] File WK 40/3, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.

Version 5.0 - Hoede Wraal - Version 5.0

b) Or is it that my training programs are starting to bear fruit to such an extent that I am busy to work myself out of my job?

Who knows the answer?

Because of this somewhat unexpected development I would like to ask you to help finding predator control work. If you know of individual farmers or farmers associations who may be interested in my services, please let me know.

Your co-operation will be much appreciated.

encl.: My pamphlet[335]."

In a letter dated 9 January 1991[336], Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) referred Mr. Peter Schneekluth (Wildlife Damage Control, Prins Albert) to his letter of 2 January 1991. The content was noted and forwarded to the next meeting of the Policy Committee. The NWGA of SA distributed a monthly newsletter to about 1 400 leader farmers. The newsletter, "*Wolbaal / Wool Bale*" was well received by farmers and it was advised he advertised in the newsletter at R350. The next issue of the Wool Bale was due for distribution at the end of March. A copy of the newsletter was attached, the size of an advertisement was about 13x10.5 cm and if Mr. Schneekluth was interested, he should contact the NWGA's office.

In a fax dated 9 January 1991[337], Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) contacted Dr. van der Klashorst[338] (CSIR. Pretoria), who was interested in manufacturing poison getters locally, and provided contact details [actual addresses/tel. no's omitted] of several experts in problem animal control: (1) Mr. P. Schneekluth, Prins Albert – expert on problem animal control plus a copy of "*Peter's pamphlet*" attached; (2) Dr. H.O. Fourie, Alkantrant, Toxicologist – expert on a possible substitute poison for 1080; (3) Mr. Niël Ferreira, Division Nature Conservations, PAO – expert on poison ejectors (getters); and (4) Mr. T.F. Roux, Chief Hunter, Oranjejag, Bloemfontein – regarding poison ejectors (getters).

In a letter dated 18 January 1991[339] to Mr. Theuns Botha (Secretary: NPAPC) responded to Mr. J.W.S. Helm's (Secretary: Albertinia Problem Animal Hunt Club) letter of 10 December 1990. The content was noted. A copy of the letter was forwarded directly to Mr. P.F. Hugo (Chairman: Breërivier RSC, Worcester) for the necessary attention. The letter would also be referred to the forthcoming meeting of the Problem Animal Policy Committee, scheduled for the end of April.

In a letter dated 22 January 1991[340], Dr. G.H. van der Klashorst (Manager: Organic Chemicals, CSIR, Pretoria) responded to Mr. Theuns Botha's (Manager: NWGA) to Dr. Paterson (CSIR) and their telephone call earlier that week regarding the development of a poison as substitute for 1080:

- The CSIR could get involved in managing such a project, but it was recommended Roodeplaat Laboratories should conduct the project. That company was in their opinion best positioned for the task.
- Dr. Peet Delport already indicated their willingness for cooperation and would soon contact Mr. Botha in that regard.

[335] Editor's Note: an undated 4-page pamphlet "Peter's Probleemdierbeheer/Wildlife Damage Control.
[336] File WK 40/3, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[337] File WK 40/3, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[338] Editor's Note: correct spelling for Glashorst - *Dr. G.H. van der Klashorst*.
[339] File WK 40/3, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[340] File WK 40/3, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.

Version 5.0 - HD de Waal - Version 5.0

In a letter dated 24 January 1991[341], Dr. P.C. Delport (Marketing Director: Roodeplaat Research Laboratories Pty Ltd, Pretoria) wrote to Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) regarding the inquiry on problem animals:

- Before a research proposal could be submitted, a number of issues must be clarified: (1) What was the target animal? Did they want to exterminate only the sheep catcher or any other animals such as vagrant dogs, etc. which did not necessarily catch sheep. (2) What did you want exclude? Only birds of prey or also other carnivores and people. (3) Preference for a method. Was there an existing method which they preferred for example collar, poison ejector etc. or could they themselves think of any method. (4) Which remedies were used already and were any problems encountered in using it?
- After an answer was received, an indication would be provided regarding the type of research envisaged.
- Firstly, a quote would be provided to conduct a literature review of the different methods of application and potential remedies that could be used.
- Based on the literature, recommendations would then be made and a method proposed for further research. A protocol would be compiled for each aspect with an appropriate quote for each. A contract would be closed, stipulating the fees, as well as confirming the dates to commence and complete the task.

In a letter dated 24 January 1991[342], Mr. J. Lensing provided the following feedback to Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA of SA):

- Problem Animal Policy Committee: Follow-up actions.
- Receipt of the minutes of 15 November 1990 and the circular was acknowledged and responded on specific points.
- Point 4.3: Communication: (a) The Chief Directorate has only one manual for a problem animal course; a copy has already been provided to the Secretary. Farmers cannot order the manual – it was usually issued to persons attending the courses. Therefore, a stock of unlimited quantities of the manual could not be supplied on demand to farmers because of the cost involved. The Secretary was requested not to report in the media that the manual was available on demand. (b) As already communicated by telephone on 23 January 1991 course manuals would not be send to all members of the Committee but only to the Federal Problem Animal Control Association of Transvaal. (c) When the course manual was studied, it would be clear that the correct use of the different control methods and equipment was continuously stressed as well as the reasons to comply. An additional section would therefore be superfluous. The manual was under revision to incorporate results from recent research but this process would take some time to complete (information going out to farmers must be cautiously planned and thoroughly checked). Therefore, a revised manual would not be made available before 25 January 1991. (d) The Chief Directorate provided training for the following control methods: (i) poison ejector, (ii) baboon cage trap, (iii) predator cage trap (for cats), (iv) foothold trap, and (v) the use of mist nets to control weavers in wheat areas (in cooperation with the Department of Agricultural Development). The first four methods were usually presented together or in different permutations of combination. Courses were only presented on demand (usually by a farmers' association) and there was no prior determined program (schedule) for courses. The Chief Directorate sets the norms for the courses and present no training that was not "nature friendly."
- Point 4.4: Manual. The OFS manual was studied and comments would be submitted in due time.

[341] File WK 40/3, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[342] File ANO 7/138, General Provincial Services Branch, Chief Directorate Nature and Environmental Conservation, Provincial Administration of the Cape of Good Hope.

Version 5.0 - Hoe de Waal - Version 5.0

- Point 4.6: Articles on problem animals. The research section of the Chief Directorate was requested to keep the "Golden Fleece" and "Red Meat" in mind when popular articles were published on problem animals.
- Point 7: Correspondence. The respective regional offices of the Chief Directorate were requested to contact the authors of the letters and provide the services to them.
- It was trusted the input was satisfactory and Mr. Johan Lensing was looking forward to further cooperation with the Committee.

In a letter dated 25 January 1991[343], Mr. N.A. Ferreira provided the following feedback to Mr. Theuns Botha (The Chairman: Problem Animal Policy Committee/NWGA of SA):

- Circular to all members, Problem Policy Committee, Point 3C.
- Reference was made to the letter of 13 December 1990.
- Attached was copy of the additional chapter regarding humane control, which would be added to the Province's manual on control of problem animals. The final manual would be available after the comments of the members of the Committee were received and incorporated:
- 5. Humane control
- The incorrect use of catching devices and poison result in the unnecessary suffering of problem and non-target animals. The statement may seem illogical to the livestock farmer, while a black-backed was regularly catching his lambs. The foothold trap may injure the animal and unnecessary long-suffering can be caused if the trap is not visited frequently. The same applies for some poisons that cause serious pain before the animal dies.
- The aims should be to control the specific predator that caused the small livestock losses. Thus, the small livestock losses would end quickest with the fewest non-target animals being killed. Follow the recommendations in the manual meticulously.
- 5.1 Tips
- There were a few tips to prevent unnecessary suffering of animals: (1) Set the foothold traps next to the footpath and not in a footpath or an opening in a fence used by livestock, game or other wildlife. Use a bait to lure the problem animal to the foothold trap. That is selective control. (2) Set the tension of the pan that the foothold trap is not activated when a weight of 1 kg is placed on the pan. It should be activated by a weight of more than 1 kg, thus smaller animals will not be trapped. (3) Buy only foothold traps with offset jaws - 5 mm between the jaws; trapped small non-target animals can be released. It will also prevent the paw of a trapped animal going numb; they chew it off and escape. (4) Make sure there are at least two swivels in the anchor chain to prevent the animal from twisting its paw off. (5) Maintain strict supervision over the person who is handling the traps to prevent poaching of wildlife. (6) Inspect the foothold traps and cage traps daily, preferably in the morning. Thus, an animal, which is usually trapped during the night, would not experiencing pain and suffering too long, starve or die of dehydration during the heat of day. (7) Only use the trapping devices or poison when it is really needed. Keep record of where foothold traps, cage traps, poison or poison ejectors were set. Thus, another person can also help to locate it, kill or release a trapped animal or recover the equipment.
- 5.2 methods to quickly kill trapped animals
- Similar to the acceptable procedure to shoot or slaughter farm animals as quickly as possible, predators must also be killed as quickly as possible.
- 5.3 Methods to release animals
- Predators caught in a foothold trap can be released with the aid of a panel with a groove, which must always be kept in the vehicle. Approach the animal from the back and

[343] File N10/1/81 Directorate: Nature & Environmental Conservation, Orange Free State Provincial Administration.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

place the groove over foothold trap and paw with the panel between you and the animal. Release the paw from the trap and wait until the animal has escaped.

- A pipe with a noose (in a rope that fits through the pipe) can also be used. Place the noose over the snout or head of the animal. Press the animal down and stand on the pipe while the foothold trap is released. Guide the animal to a fence or the side of a ditch where it can be released safely without injuring the person.

In a letter dated 29 January 1991[344], Mr. Peter Schneekluth (Wildlife Damage Control, Prins Albert) thanked Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) for the letter dated 9 January 1991:

- He appreciated that his letter would be brought to the attention of the Problem Animal Policy Committee.
- Regarding the advertisement in the Wool Bale, it was unfortunately too expensive – it was also a fact that a single advert in general provides very little result. He has started with classified adverts in the Landbouweekblad – under sheep and game.
- Furthermore, he also advertised at strategic places such as cooperatives where posters were hung. Two "vermin posters" were provided separately to Mr. Botha.
- He inquired whether it would not be a good idea to hang one or two of his posters in clear view at the venue where the Problem Animal Policy Committee was meeting. It would perhaps remind the gentlemen, while they were struggling with problem animal policy issues, that there was also a private option available to combat problem animals.

In a letter dated 30 January 1991[345], Mr. P.P.M. Wessels (Technical Director: AVCASA[346]) responded to the Mr. Theuns Botha's (Secretary: NPAPC) letter dated 13 December 1990:

- Developing alternative poison as substitute for 1080.
- There was no division at AVCASA that could get involved in developing new poisons.
- All development of new remedies was conducted by member companies themselves and they were responsible for its registration under Act 36/1947.
- A substitute was developed for 1080, namely P.D.B. 1.
- A copy of the proposed label and directions for use was attached.
- For more detail, they could contact Geoff Dyer Enterprises in Worcester [address].
- They could also contact Mr. Geoff Dyer [telephone] for more detail.

Mr. Wessels attached the following 2-page document to his letter of 30 January 1991:

- **Toxic Collar (contains P.D.B. 1) - Reg. No. L 4097 Act 36/1947**
- A collar containing poison for killing the predators of small livestock.
- **Poison Very Poisonous**
- **Active Ingredient**: P.D.B. 1 (Carbamate)……300 g/l
- Content……1 Poison Collar
- **Warnings**
- If the target animal survived the attack, it should not be slaughtered within 7 days for human consumption.
- **Directions for use** **Use only as indicated**

1. All the livestock in the camp where the attack occurred must be removed early in the morning and moved to separate camp.
2. Twenty (20) ewes with lambs of about 3-months of age must be separated and each lamb fitted with a poison collar as indicated in the attached photographs.

[344] File WK 40/3, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[345] File WK 40/3, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[346] AVCASA - Agricultural and Veterinary Chemicals Association of South Africa.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

3. A further sixty (60) to eight (80) adult sheep must be selected from the flock and joined with the ewes and their lambs at foot; the total group of hundred (100) to hundred and twenty (120) animals will now form the target group. These animals are now returned to the camp where the predator attack occurred.
4. The removal of the livestock flock and the return of the target flock to the camp where the predator attack occurred must be completed on the same day. Only sheep accustomed to the camp where the predator attack occurred must be used for the target flock and no other sheep.
5. Jackals and caracals predate young lambs in preference over adult sheep. Therefore, the poison collars are fitted to lambs.
6. The reason for the additional sheep in the target group is merely to increase the flock size and make it easier for the predator.
7. Putting the target flock back on the same in the camp where the predator attack occurred is very important to ensure that the returning predator finds an empty camp and then simply wanders of somewhere else.
8. After a predator attacked an animal fitted with a poison collar, it will have a clear red coloured marking around the neck.

When inspected, bite-marks will be clearly visible on the poison collar and the following steps must be taken:

Carefully remove the collar to prevent the poison from spreading. If the target animal survived the attack, it should not be slaughtered within 7 days for human consumption.

The stained wool must be clipped and burned immediately.

9. The poison in the collar is sufficient to kill the jackal or caracal within about two minutes, while in most cases the animal wearing the poison collar will survive the attack.
10. To find the target predator it is suggested to start searching at the site where the sheep slept the previous night.

When the carcass of the target predator is found, it must be burned or buried immediately. All the poison collars may now be removed.

Before the poison collars are stored safely, it must be inspected thoroughly for any punctures or leaks. Damaged collars must be replaced immediately to ensure that the correct number of collars are available for the target flock when needed again.

11. As a precautionary measure, a target flock may also be placed in the camp before the main flock is moved to the camp.

In a letter dated 1 February 1991[347], Mr. Theuns Botha (Secretary: NPAPC) provided information on problem animals which was requested by Dr. P.C. Delport (Marketing Director: Roodeplaat Research Laboratories Pty Ltd, Pretoria) on 24 January 1991:

1. The target animals are those jackals or caracals that are catching sheep. In other words, they want to exterminate only the sheep catchers.
2. Obviously people should affect a minimum disturbance to the ecology, therefore a compound was needed which would not harm birds of prey, other carnivores and people.
3. Preference of a method – the easiest method would be to place the poison in such a way (e.g. in meat) that would kill only damage causing animals. A registered poison was already used in the poison collar while cyanide was used in the poison ejectors.
4. The committee held the opinion that a poison, similar to 1080, should be developed, which could be used in the same way, but without the dangers specifically associated with 1080.

- Dr. Delport was specifically made aware of the Problem Animal Policy Committee's policy statements regarding the humane use of poisons and foothold traps (see Annexure).

[347] File WK 40/3, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.

Version 5.0 - Hoe de Wiel - Version 5.0

- Mr. C.L. Greyling, a member of the Committee, was also requested make contact with Dr. Delport.

On 1 February 1991[348] Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) wrote to Mr. C.L. Greyling (Wakkerstroom). With reference to "Poison: problem animal" copies of correspondence (dated 24 January and 1 February 1991) with Dr. P.C. Delport (Marketing Director: Roodeplaat Research Laboratories Pty Ltd, Pretoria) were attached. Mr. Greyling was very knowledgeable about 1080; therefore, it would be appreciated if he could contact Dr. P.C. Delport directly as soon as possible [telephone] in order for the investigation to proceed.

In a letter dated 11 February 1991[349], Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) thanked Mr. Peter Schneekluth (Wildlife Damage Control, Prins Albert) for the letter dated 29 January 1991 and the posters which was received.

- It would be arranged for the posters to be exhibited at the congresses of the Natal and the Transvaal NGWA, as well as at the forthcoming meeting of the Problem Animal Policy Committee.
- It was also suggested that he contacted Mr. Jan Bezuidenhout, Editor: Golden Fleece (SA Wool Board) to arrange for publishing an article regarding his activities. The Landbouweekblad could also be contacted in that regard.

In a letter dated 11 February 1991[350], Mr. Theuns Botha (Secretary: NPAPC) responded to the letter of Mr. P.P.M. Wessels (Technical Director: AVCASA) regarding developing alternative poison as substitute for 1080. The content of the letter was noted, but it was pointed out that the NPAPC was not convinced that PDB 1 was an alternative poison because, according to their information, Mr. Dyer had exclusive rights to it. Nevertheless, the letter would be referred to the next meeting of the Problem Animal Policy Committee.

On 11 February 1991[351], Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) wrote to Dr. P.C. Delport (Marketing Director: Roodeplaat Research Laboratories Pty Ltd, Pretoria) regarding "developing poison" and attached a letter received from Mr. P.P.M. Wessels (Technical Director: AVCASA) for his information.

In a letter dated 11 February 1991[352], Mr. G.M. Schutte (Assistant Manager: RPO) referred to Mr. Theuns Botha's (Secretary: NPAPC) letter of 13 December 1990 regarding Levies: Problem Animal Control:

- At the meeting on 28 and 29 January 1991, the RPO Executive noted that the matter regarding the desirability to use levy money for training was referred for consideration to provincial congresses.
- The Executive also decided that comments from the provincial RPO congresses should be referred to the RPO Small Livestock Committee for a final decision.
- It was also noted that the Problem Animal Policy Committee would submit further proposals in that regard at its meeting in April. The Executive would like to attend further to the matter after receiving the forgoing proposals.

Version 5.0 – Hoole Weal – Version 5.0

[348] File WK 40/3, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[349] File WK 40/3, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[350] File WK 40/3, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[351] File WK 40/3, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[352] File 14/1/8 Red Meat Producers' Organisation, Pretoria.

In a letter dated 20 February 1991[353], Mr. J.C. Botha (Senior Operations Officer) wrote to Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) regarding two points of discussion which were accepted at the recent Free State RPO Congress in Bloemfontein:

1. Effective control of vermin: As a result of the huge increase of vermin in the Free State, congress discussed a more effective way to control vermin by considering the following:
   - Training farmers as hunters
   - Training of farm workers to set poison ejectors
   - Amending the Ordinance to legalise private hunt clubs
   - Better financing of Oranjejag.
2. Dogs: The Congress requested the Provincial Administration to ensure that legislation, specifically regarding the keeping of dogs by individuals, was enforced uniformly because huge livestock losses occurred near urban areas.

- It seems that similar points of discussion served at the Free State NWGA Congress. Therefore, the Free State RPO supported the NWGA and proposed a joint effort. A joint delegation from the NWGA and the Free State RPO to Oranjejag and the Provincial Administration could be more meaningful than action by the two organisations separately.
- They inquired about the NWGA's viewpoint in this regard.

In a letter dated 27 February 1991[354], Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) referred Mr. J.C. Botha (Senior Operations Officer) to his letter (dated 20 February 1991) regarding the two points of discussion which were accepted at the Free State RPO Congress:

- The issue was discussed with the National President, Mr. P.E. Kingwill and it was suggested to consider referring it to the NPAPC.
- Representatives of the RPO, Messrs. G. du Plessis and J.L. van der Walt, Oranjejag, Messrs. Nel and Roux, and the Free State NWGA, Mr. W, Wessels, served on the committee. It would be more meaningful to deliberate the issue mentioned in the letter jointly at the committee. However, if the OFS RPO still wanted to proceed, it was suggested to approach the Provincial Administration directly and discuss the matter. Copies of the letters would also be forwarded to the President of the Free State NGWA, Mr. Johan Neethling.

In a letter dated 4 March 1991[355], Mr. Peter Schneekluth (Wildlife Damage Control, Prins Albert) thanked Mr. Theuns Botha (Chairman: NWGA) thanked for the letter dated 11 February 1991. He appreciated the willingness to exhibit the posters at several congresses. He would follow up on the suggestion to contact Mr. Jan Bezuidenhout, Editor of the Golden Fleece regarding making his services to combat vermin available.

On 5 March 1991[356], Mr. John Fair (Manager Pasture Advice, NWGA Harrismith) forwarded a letter to Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA). The letter was sent on 4 February 1991[357] to Mr. Peter Kingwill (Rietpoort, Murraysburg) and contained valuable information on problem animal control. Mr. Kingwill (Chairman: NPAPC) suggested that the letter be sent to all other members of the committee.

> "*Good Morning Peter*
>
> *I promised to keep you informed about what was taking place with regard to problem animal control in the Eastern Free State and Natal*
>
> ***Cooperation Natal Parks Board***
>
> *I took your advice and got hold of David Cook of the natal Parks Board in Pietermaritzburg. He sent Greg Laws to a meeting we held here in Harrismith to give us*

[353] 1991/2/20 the Free State Agricultural Union, Bloemfontein.
[354] File WK 40/3, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[355] File WK 40/3, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[356] File WK 40/3, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[357] File WK 40/3, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.

Version 5.0 HO de Waal - Version 5.0

some information on how to set about dealing with the problem. When I say us I mean the Eastern Free State Woolled Sheep Action Committee (An off-shoot of the Highveld Regional Committee.)

During the meeting we came to the following conclusion. In telegramme style they are as follows:

1. Farmers must take the responsibility for predator control; they cannot expect any outside organization to do it for them.

2. Farmers will have to be trained in predator control and be issued with certificates in order to enable them to handle the necessary equipment.

3. Farm workers should be trained in the hunting of predators.

4. As Natal Parks Board does not have the expertise to do the training, specialists will have to be contracted.

5. The NWGA has the necessary infra-structure to set up training courses.

Farmer and labourer course

A two day course for farmers to be held at the Spioenkop resort (Natal Parks Board) on the 20 & 21st of May is planned. We have contacted John Colborne, a professional hunter from Johannesburg, to conduct the course. (I believe he studied under Pieter Schneekluth[358].) The concept is to first train farmers in gin trapping and hunting.

The farmers course will be followed up with a 7 to 10 day course (23-28 May) for their farm workers to train them to do the hunting. The cost of the course will be ±R200/farmer and ±R400/labourer.

Publications

I mentioned to you that Tony Bowland had prepared a publication entitles Sheep Predation. He was planning to put this into a publication and was looking for sponsorship to do this. I have attached his draft copy.

I don't think that it is suitable material for farmers in its present form. It does, however, contain some very valuable information. Especially the section on identification of the problem animal which was responsible for the kill. Tony points out that farmers often make a hasty and incorrect diagnoses. Because of this their counter action is doomed to failure because they hunt the wrong animal.

I believe that I could put this material into a pamphlet which we could publish. Tony has excellent photographic material which could be used to back it up.

Restrictive legislation

I have been informed by Mr. Gerrie Greyling, Chairman of the Harrismith Farmers Union, that there are a number of Free State ordinances which are blocking the way of farmers who wish to take action against problem-animals. These are briefly as follows:

1. Farmer hunt clubs are prohibited.

2. Professional hunting of problem animals is prohibited.

3. Farmers are not permitted to use Coyote-getters (In Natal, farmers can use them provided they have attended a course and passed the necessary examination)."

In a letter dated 6 March 1991[359], Mr. L.P. White (Secretary: Uniondale Farmers Wool and Mohair Growers' Association, Uniondale) wrote to Mr. Pieter Kingwill[360] (Rietpoort, Murraysburg) and a letter which was sent on 18 July 1990 to the Secretary of the Langkloof Rural Council, RSC in Oudtshoorn:

- This Association decided unanimously on 14 June 1990 to make representations to the Langkloof Rural Council regarding the control of vermin.
- The past few years farmers incurred very large losses because of a huge increase of vermin, namely caracals, jackals, etc.

[358] Editor's Note: Schneutler - *Peter Schneekluth.*
[359] File WK 40/3, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[360] Editor's Note: Kinghorn - Mr. Peter Kingwill.

Version 5.0 - Hendriwaal - Version 5.0

- Considering the very large area which must be covered by the Council's Vermin Control official, namely from Barrydale to Joubertina, it makes sense it cannot be served effectively. Furthermore, in the Karoo part of the Uniondale district the five packs of hunt hounds and about 20 trained poison ejector operators were unable to serve all farms effectively. Therefore, it was suggested to change the system by moving the onus to the farmer to become responsible for controlling problem animals. The funds currently used to control such animals could be used more economically justifiable by subsidising individual farmers for assuming responsibility to exterminate vermin on their own farms.
- If funds could be made available, for example R50/jackal, R40/caracal, R5/Cape fox, R10/baboon, R5/African wildcat, it would encourage farmers to control vermin, irrespective whether they farm with small livestock themselves.
- It would be appreciated if the support of the other Rural Councils in the area of the RSC could be obtained in this regard.
- It was trusted the issue would receive favourable consideration.

On 7 March 1991[361], Mr. J.C. Botha (Senior Operations Officer) referred to Mr. Theuns Botha's (Manager: NWGA) letter of 27 February 1991. The recommendation regarding the two points of discussion was accepted and the Vice Chairman, Mr. G. du Plessis would be asked to introduce it at a meeting of the NPAPC.

In a fax dated 14 March 1991[362], Mr. D.J. Cook (Deputy Director: West, Natal Parks Board) apologised for the delay in providing feedback to Mr. Theuns Botha's (Secretary: NPAPC) circular letter of 13 December 1990. The following actions have been taken:

> "(a) *Comments have been submitted to the Director, OFS Nature Conservation Department on the OFS problem animal control manual, as requested.*
>
> *(a) The volume of literature constituting the various NPB Training manuals is considerable and it is not feasible to reproduce these for distribution to members. Instead a full set is being dispatched to you under separate cover. Our suggestion here is that a national training manual should be developed from all the available manuals, through the committee (see attached list[363]).*
>
> *(b) The draft problem animal control strategy is well advanced and should be with you by the March 28, 1991 deadline."*

In a letter dated 18 March 1991[364], Mr. Theuns Botha (Secretary: NPAPC) acknowledged receipt of Mr. L.P. White's (Secretary: Uniondale Farmers Wool and Mohair Growers' Association, Uniondale) letter (dated 6 March 1991), as well as the letter to Mr. Peter Kingwill (dated 18 July 1990).

- The content of the letter was noted and it was confirmed that it was in line with the view of the NPAPC.
- It was a local issue; therefore, it was recommended they address it directly with the RSC. A copy of the letter would also be forwarded to Mr. P.F. Hugo, Chairman: Breërivier RSC, and representing all the RSCs on the Problem Animal Policy Committee.

In a letter dated 20 March 1991[365], Mr. D.J. Cook (Deputy Director: West, Natal Parks Board) referred Mr. Theuns Botha (Secretary: NPAPC) to his faxed communication of 14 March 1991 and attached a draft of the National Problem Animal Control Strategy for discussion at the next meeting of the policy committee on 25 April 1991 (Copies were provided to Mr. P.E. Kingwill

[361] 1991/3/7 the Free State Agricultural Union, Bloemfontein.
[362] File WK 40/3, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[363] Editor's Note: List of seven titles – Natal Parks Board linked training course literature – was attached.
[364] File WK 40/3, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[365] File WK 40/3, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.

Version 5.0 - HO De Waal - Version 5.0

and Mr. B.R. Wilkinson for their information). This was a markedly improved daft document since the first copy dated 19 October 1990[366].

The Natal & East Griqualand Branch of the NWGA issued a report[367] on 27 March 1991:

"***Report on Research Project regarding predators***

Mr. A.P. Pretorius

A concise report to producers, wool growers' and farmers associations who contributed to the Research Project which was undertaken by producers and the Provincial Administration in co-operation with the University of Natal:

Although the project was not fully completed, it was terminated at the end of 1990 as a result of a lack of funds.

The question to be answered, is what has been gained by this project. The project was undertaken with the aim of finding methods which would minimise the loss of sheep caused by predators.

Various aspects have been analysed by the two researchers from the University, and methods and recommendations on how producers can attempt to minimise their losses were made known. The emphasis was especially on preventative measures which can be implemented. However, full details will not be given in this report – we would like to bring to your attention that there is a video which has been produced by the University and which is available to producers[368].

We would like to take this opportunity to thank you once again for your loyal support – appreciation also to stock farmers[369] for the administration of the funds collected.

Notwithstanding, predators are still on the increase. In order to make an effort to combat this problem, the Small Stock Committee of the Natal RPO recently decided to investigate the possibility of introducing a levy per sheep sold in order to launch effective combatting attempts in Natal. The aim is to put existing clubs and persons, as well as new combatting teams and methods in the field, and in this way, attempting to cover as wide a range as possible. In order to be considered for financial support from this fund, proof [must be provided] of effective combatting methods such as the eliminating of jackals, lynx and vagrant dogs which cause damage.

We trust that the endeavours will enjoy your support – we would like to have your Association's view on these efforts. It would be appreciated if you could contact me directly [telephone number] or your nearest NWGA Executive Member.

Sincere thanks on behalf of the Executive of the NWGA and RPO."

On 27 March 1991[370], Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) informed the Executive[371]: NWGA Natal & East Griqualand Branch on behalf of the President, Mr. A.P. Pretorius, about the next meeting of the Problem Animal Committee scheduled for 15 May 1991 in the Holiday Inn, Bloemfontein. An agenda was attached, highlighting the main point, namely: Discussion on whether a levy per sheep for combating problem animals is justified and acceptable; suggestions on how such a scheme can be implemented; distribution of funds (involvement of outside organisations). This meeting would coincide with the NWGA's National Congress and was an effort to utilise limited funds more effectively. Only Mr. Geldart could not attend, but the Chairman would handle his input on the agenda on his behalf.

[366] Editor's Note: This draft was further adapted and edited by the National Problem Policy Committee at its meeting of 25 April 1991. The final revised National Problem Animal Control Strategy was dated 11 July 1991.
[367] File WK 40/3, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[368] Editor's Note: Detail was provided to order the video and guide at R50.00.
[369] Editor's Note: Account/funds was administered by Stockowners - Chief Accountant.
[370] File WK 40/3, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[371] Editor's Note: Messrs. A.P. Pretorius, S.M. Bester, P.J. Naudé, W.A. Human and K.R. Geldart.

Version 5.0 – PD de Waal – Version 5.0

Oranjejag requested the Administration on 2 April 1991 for payment of the annual subsidy for the period 1 April 1991 to 31 March 1992. On 17 April 1991 the Administration paid R561 000 as subsidy to Oranjejag for the 1991/92 financial year[372].

On 2 April 1991[373], Dr. A. Immelman (Roodeplaat Research Laboratories Pty Ltd) thanked Mr. Kingwill (Chairman: NWGA) for having being able to meet him in Pretoria, furthermore:

- Controlling problem animals such as jackals and caracals required the knowledge of many scientists. The Company could provide expertise on poisons, their actions and potential dangers. They also have the capacity to conduct extensive literature reviews and experiments to gain information on what may be needed. They were not informed about the behaviour and preferences of problem animals, but have contact with skilled persons of high calibre at other institutions such as universities.
- It was confirmed that Dr. Immelman was willing to personally provide advice, free of charge, to Mr. Kingwill or the Committee on his field of expertise, namely pharmacology and toxicology. If such advice were deemed necessary, he would appreciate to be advised of a date for such a meeting.
- In their discussions and the letter by Mr. Botha, the advantages of 1080 was praised. Apparently, the successes with this poison was good before it was banned. It was his opinion that the Department of Health had a wrong impression of 1080. The danger for humans was not as great as claimed. From the limited literature at his disposal it appears that, the toxic dose for humans was 5 mg/kg, which was comparable to strychnine. For dogs, the toxic dose was about 0.1 mg/kg. In the past, it was also alleged that 1080 could not be detected in the body. In a 1990 publication, a gas chromatographic method was described to successfully demonstrate the compound in biological material.
- The finding that poultry was less susceptible to the poison as for example dogs, opened interesting possibilities to limit the damage to birds of prey. However, no specific information was available regarding the effect of 1080 on birds of prey.
- It was proposed to extend the literature study and make a representation to the relevant authorities to unban 1080. The distribution of the compound could be limited to prevent its general use, except by certain persons who could be held responsible.
- Another project, which received attention, was the development of the poison collar. It remained the best way to control the specific problem animal. The design and practical problems in this concept would require the input of several knowledgeable persons. If 1080 was not available, there were other possibilities, which could be considered such as aldicarb, carbofurane, isodrin or some organophosphates.
- It was trusted the information would assist in taking a decision and if more questions arose they would be pleased to help.

In a fax dated 4 April 1991[374], Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) confirmed with Miss. Oosthuizen (Dept. of Transport: Jan Smuts Airport) the booking of the Big Conference Room for 25 April 1991 from 10h00 to 16h00. About 20 persons would attend the meeting. A cheque for R180.00 (R30.00 per hour) was posted for her personal attention. He also inquired about the specific name of the venue and where it was located at the Airport.

In a fax dated 4 April 1991[375] to Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA), Miss. E. Oosthuizen (Dept. of Transport: Jan Smuts Airport) acknowledged receipt of his fax (4 April 1991) and

[372] File N12/7/4 - Payment advice, dated 17 April 1981 and Oranjejag letter, dated 2 April 1991.
[373] File WK 40/3, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[374] File WK 40/3, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[375] File JSA 61/13/1/2 Office of the Airport Manager, Jan Smuts Airport.

Version 5.0 - Hoc de Waal - Version 5.0

confirmed that the Big Conference Room was booked for 25 April 1991 from 10h00 to 16h00. The venue was next to the International Restaurant.

In a fax dated 4 April 1991[376] to Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA), Miss. Sylvia Kemp (Airport Services, Jan Smuts Airport) provided information on the menus which were available on 25 April 1991.

In a letter dated 4 April 1991[377], Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) wrote to Miss. Oosthuizen (Dept. of Transport: Jan Smuts Airport) and attached a cheque for R180.00 (R30.00 per hour) for booking of the Big Conference Room for 25 April 1991 from 10h00 to 16h00.

This letter was only received on 2 April 1991 at the NWGA office. On 15 February 1991 Mr. B.R. Wilkinson informed[378] Mr. Theuns Botha (Secretary: NPAPC) that to date the Administration did not receive the minutes of the Committee's meeting of 15 November 1990. If available, the minutes should be posted marked for the attention of Mr. B.R. Wilkinson. Should the minutes not be available they wished to be advised when to expect a copy.

In a letter dated 4 April 1991[379], Miss. Charlotte van der Westhuizen (Operations Assistant: NWGA) responded to Mr. B.R. Wilkinson; his letter (2/4/251/2) dated 15 February was only received by the NWGA office on 4 April. It was confirmed that the minutes and circular were posted to all members on 13 December 1990. However, for his information a copy of the minutes and circular were attached.

In a Notice (5 April 1991)[380] to all Members of the NPAPC, Mr. Theuns Botha (Secretary: NPAPC) reminded everybody about the forthcoming meeting on 25 April 1991 in the Big Conference Room, Jan Smuts Airport (2nd floor adjacent to the International Restaurant). The meeting would commence at 10h00 and conclude at about 16h00. Furthermore, "*The agenda for this meeting will be posted to you within 10 days. We once again bring to your attention the actions as stipulated in the minutes which were posted to you on 12 December 1990. As poor response has been received on these actions, it would be appreciated if you could make your input at the meeting*."

Statistics regarding problem animal control in the different regions of the Free State Province were listed in Oranjejag's 1991 Annual Report[381] by the Chairman.

[376] File WK 40/3, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[377] File WK 40/3, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[378] File 2/4/251/2 Natal Provincial Administration, Pietermaritzburg.
[379] File WK 40/3, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[380] WK 40/3, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[381] Oranjejag 1991 Annual Report - Problem Animal Statistics per region in the Orange Free State Province

	Brown hyaena	Caracal		Black-backed jackal		Cape fox		African wildcat		Vagrant dogs	
Region	Getters	Hounds	Cages	Hounds	Getters	Hounds	Getters	Hounds	Cages	Getters	Total
Bloemfontein		81	12	149	67	62	660	67	5	17	1120
Smithfield		51	21	51	9	16	179	24	2	9	362
Boshof		40	5	191	188	57	575	23	3	12	1094
Ventersburg		37	2	200	256	36	715	11	1	77	1335
Warden	1	12	20	156	125	87	730	6	2	76	1215
Training-hunters	2			4	37		4			3	50
Total	3	221	60	751	682	258	2863	131	13	194	5176

Version 5.0 - Hoop de Waal - Version 5.0

In a letter dated 8 April 1991[382], Mr. N.J. Vermaak (Assistant Manager: NWGA) referred Mr. N.A. Ferreira (Free State Directorate Nature Conservation) to their telephone conversation earlier the morning. Attached were copies of Peter Schneekluth's "*My five favourite gin trap sets to catch Jackal and Lynx*" and L. Boddicker's "*Predator damage control – a state of the art and condition, Part 1*".

In a circular dated 9 April 1991)[383] to all Members of the NPAPC, Mr. Theuns Botha (Secretary: NPAPC) referred to the reminder of the meeting of 25 April 1991 and attached a copy of the agenda. Members were requested to confirm by telephone if they could attend and, if not, whom the substitute would be. Some documents, which were handed out at the previous meeting, were again included in the agenda for information and to enable members to prepare themselves in advance for the meeting. Any other documents received until the meeting would only be distributed at the meeting. In conclusion to the members: "*you will note the ecologically friendly colour in which this agenda was reproduced*."

In a report to the Director of Nature and Environment Conservation, Mr. N.A. Ferreira, a nature conservation scientist, proposed three options for a more effective control of predator damage by Oranjejag[384]. The options were: (1) privatising predation control with a gradual phasing out of the current control system; (2) improve the current control system; and (3) retain the current control system. The report concluded:

> "*The control of predator damage in the province is not only a biological, sociological and economical problem, but is also political in nature. A fundamental error in judgement was made in 1965 when the physical control of predators was taken away from farmers and transferred to a central hunt club. This has led to the current attitude of farmers that they are not responsible for the control of their predator damage. The control system of Oranjejag is not suitable to reduce the predator damage of small livestock farmers effectively."*

Based on the justification provided in the report, it was stated:

> "*If the principles of a nature management programme are to be implemented, option 1 is recommended*."

In a fax dated 11 April 1991[385], Mr. Jan van der Walt (Manager: RPO) forwarded Mr. John D. Colborne's letter which was addressed to Mr. G. Schutte (RPO) regarding "Problem Animal Control" to Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA):

> "*Dear Gerhard*
>
> *Herewith as discussed a short introduction to my organisation in addition to a pricing list, the list is not comprehensive as ae also offer a range of trapping equipment, lamping kits, etc.*
>
> *Due to a shortage of time I was not able to produce a pamphlet for use at the forthcoming meetings. I am however working on one for future use and as soon as it is ready, will let you have a few copies. I also have not yet been able to contact Mr. Theuns Botha.*
>
> *I would appreciate if you would let Farmers know of our services whenever you have contact with them.*
>
> *Problem Animal Control is a private concern that was born as a result of coming into contact with many farmers, all of whom have experienced losses of one sort or another due to problem animals.*

[382] File WK 40/3, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[383] File WK 40/3, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[384] File N10/1/82 – Verslag deur Mnr. N.A. Ferreira (Natuurbewaringswetenskaplike) aan die Direkteur Natuur- en Omgewingbewaring: Voorstelle vir die meer effektiewe beheer van roofdierskade deur Oranjejag (91-04-10).
[385] File 14/1/8 Red Meat Producers' Organisation, Pretoria.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

These problem animals and birds range from Crows, Pigeons, Finches, Meerkat, Dassies, Porcupine, Baboon. Vervet monkey to the predators like Jackal, Caracal and feral dogs or cats.

We are unique in this country in that we offer on a professional basis, training in trapping methods, in shooting techniques and in undertaking Contract removal of the majority of problem animals. To my knowledge there is no other private organisation geared up to offer all these services.

In the relatively short time that Problem Animal Control has existed, it has helped many farmers.

The courses we offer are as follows:

A. Basic course. This course lasts 2 days. It covers both training and shooting techniques. Cost – R175.00 to R200.00 per person. Dependant on area.

B. Extended course. The duration of this course is between 7-10 days. Cost – R350.00 to R400.00 per person. Dependent on area.

C. Individual Solutions. In certain instances a need exists for a specific plan to be devised for a specific situation. In cases such as this we would tailor a package that includes some training as in the short course and specific advice on trap locations and procedures. This by its very nature is extremely flexible and its duration can be as short as 1 day but on some instances could take up to 3-4 days. Costs – R350.00 – R400.00 per day. Dependant on area.

Contract removal. For the farmer who has a problem but may not be able to take advantage of any of the above solutions we offer as an alternative a 'Removal Service'. This entails a visit by myself to the farm to enable an analysis of the problem and to devise a strategy, and then either immediate one off action involving Trapping and/or Shooting, or periodic visits until the problem has been eliminated. The cost structure for this is as follows: (a) Problem analysis (once only) – R200.00. (b) Charge per animal trapped or shot is dependent on species. (c) Traveling fee: Johannesburg – farm – Johannesburg R0.50/km.

I must emphasise that the problem analysis is a once only fee and I do not charge a daily rate. If it is necessary to stay on the farm for a number of days there is no extra charge. Subsequent return visits are subject to the travelling fee and animal charge.

Jackal / Caracal (Rooikat) – R100, Feral dogs / cats – R50, Baboon – R20, Vervet monkey – R10, Dassie, meerkat, small vermin – R5, Porcupine – R10, Warthog – R40, Bush pig – R100, Feral pigs – R100, Crow – R2, Pigeon – R1.

Equipment. We offer a comprehensive range of equipment for the trapper or vermin shooter. Ranging from traps and scent baits to specialised clothing, lamping kits for night shooting and even specialised weapons.

I trust that the foregoing will be of some assistance and look forward to being able to show results for you.

Yours Faithfully

John D Colborne."

On 11 April 1991,[386] Mr. G.P. Visagie faxed a 16-page document (including six figures), namely "*Acceptable Problem Animal Control Methods 1991*", which was compiled by the Interprovincial Problem Animal Committee, to Mr. Theuns Botha (Problem Animal Policy Committee):

- The most important prerequisite for effective control of problem animals is that the operator should have knowledge of the problem animal, control device and be motivated.
- 1. **Hunting hounds**: Hunting hounds must be disciplined and trained. Supervision of the pack is a prerequisite and hounds must be trained to take the correct spoor. The

[386] File WK 40/3, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.

Version 5.0 - H.O. de Waal - Version 5.0

appropriate mix of trackers, grey hounds and smaller dogs are important. Hounds are usually less effective during dry periods. Early in the morning when the humidity is still relatively high, the hounds are also most effective. When a pack of hounds is transferred to another area, they must be allowed to learn the "spoor" in that area to prevent them from hunting unknown non-target animals. Hounds are most effective and selective when they start tracking from a freshly caught carcass.

- 2. **Guard dogs**: Sheep dogs who are reared as pups with a flock of small livestock are very effective deterrents for jackals and caracals. Guard dogs must stay fulltime with the flock and direct or personal contact with the dog must be limited to a minimum. The dog must receive appropriate food to prevent it from wandering away and start hunting itself. If a guard dog is ineffective it must be replaced.
- 3. **Night hunting**:
- 3.1 Introduction: The goal with night hunting of problem animals is still to reduce small livestock losses. The goal can be reactive or preventative control. Reactive control means the problem animal that is already catching sheep, is located and killed. The adult animals have probably already adapted to evade vehicles and people. It applies especially to black-backed jackals. Therefore locating and killing such a problem animal with night hunting seldom successful.

  Night hunting may be more effective for preventative control, for example to reduce the number of young black-backed jackals during and after the whelping season in September. Black-backed jackals whelp only once a year (about August) and because young animals start wandering around and hunting with their parents from October, it is the appropriate time for night hunting. The young jackals are inexperienced and can be shot rather easily or caught by hounds. Night hunting is therefore mainly aimed at controlling the black-backed jackal numbers.
- 3.2 Equipment: (1) A bakkie [small freight vehicle]. (2) A spot light (at least 300 000 candlepower, and of lightweight to prevent from wearing the hunter down). (3) Two trained grey hounds. (4) A suitable calibre rifle (do not use a small calibre .22 rifle, because animals are mostly only wounded). (5) A person is driving and another is handling the spotlight, rifle and grey hounds. (6) Knowledge of night hunting and able to identify animal species at night. (7) A written letter of consent and signed by the landowner where the night hunting is conducted must be kept in their possession by the hunters. The Provincial Ordinances differ regarding which animals may be hunted at night; therefore, hunters must liaise with the local nature conservation office regarding the applicable regulations.
- 3.3 Control technique: During night, hunting the bakkie is used to drive on roads or in the veld in the area where jackals are catching sheep or they are heard at night or where their tracks are seen regularly. The terrain should be travelable for a vehicle (bakkie) and familiar to the driver because often the predator must be followed in hot pursuit. While driving through the area the spotlight is shone to both sides. The reflection of the light in the eyes of the animals helps to locate them.

  When the target predator is seen, it may be shot or hunted by releasing the two trained grey hounds from the back of the bakkie. Therefore, the team comprises a driver and at least one person at the back to handle the spotlight and control the grey hounds at the back.

  When the grey hounds see an animal in the light, they should be trained to wait for the command before jumping off to catch the animal. Thus, the hunters can hunt selectively and prevent killing of non-target animals. As soon as the grey hounds run to the target animal, the spotlight must be kept on the target animal for them to keep it in sight. It may require that the driver must follow the predator. The driver must be careful and not hit the grey hounds.

  If possible, the hunting should be against the wind direction. If a black-backed jackal is chased against the wind direction, it will start running in a semi-circle to try to get down wind itself. A hunter should not give the black-backed jackal an opportunity to get away and shoot it on sight. If the black-backed jackal was lost temporarily from sight, the direction in which it

Version 5.0 - UC de Waal - Version 5.0

was moving must be pre-empted by trying to pick up the eyes again and shoot immediately when sighted again.

- 3.4 Time of hunting: Hunt during dark moon to detect the predators easy with the spot light. Hunt from dusk until about midnight and again before dawn when it is still dark. The hunters should accept that often there would be nights when no jackal will be seen or heard. Then there are nights when the jackals will be noticed.

The season of the year also plays a role during night hunting. During late winter until early summer, the grass is short enough to see the target animals. It also coincide with the period when the young black-backed jackals are starting to wander around.

- 3.5 Training of grey hounds: Grey hounds are ideal for night hunting. At the age of two years, grey hounds are regarded as being mature. A black-backed jackal or caracal can injure a young grey hound and inhibit its aggression, causing it to be afraid to catch a predator. Therefore, the young grey hound must be trained first with well-trained grey hounds. A young grey hound must be taught to obey commands, for example to jump on the bakkie, to wait for the command before it jumps down to hunt and to return after the hunt and jump back on the bakkie. Young grey hounds must be allowed to ride with at the bakkie only from the age of six months. When they are well accustomed to that, they are taught to see animals at night with the aid of the spotlight and hunt with the trained grey hound. Only when it is physically strong enough, that is close to the age of two years, should it be allowed to catch a large and aggressive animal such as a black-backed jackal.
- 3.6 Identification and judicious hunting: It is important to identify the predator and game species on the farm at night with the aid of a spot light. It is not always that easy. Often all that can be seen are the eyes reflecting the light from far away. A golden rule for the hunter should always be to use the eyes only as an indication where the animal is. With closer investigation the animal should be identified by its body built and flight mode. Only then can the hunter be assured he will not shoot at a steenbok[387] or bat-eared fox.

Because night hunting is primarily aimed at controlling black-backed jackals, it is important to be able to identify these animals. The eyes of a black-backed jackal reflect bright red and it is customary for them to turn their heads away from the light. Its two pointed ears could also identify it.

From a nature conservation viewpoint it is important to conduct night hunting in a disciplined way and only hunt target animals.

- 4. **Foothold traps** (black-backed jackal and caracal): This control device is ineffective in areas when:

- poorly designed foothold traps[388] and/or poor setting techniques are used,
- hounds are used to hunt, and
- the habitat does not allow the trapping effort

Foothold traps can be effective provided the prescribed guidelines are followed. Important points in using this device is the choice of a place to set it, spacing of foothold traps over the range of the target animal, choice of lures/baits, setting, bedding in of the foothold trap and regular inspection of the setting spots. Foothold traps can cause unnecessary suffering of animals if the latter is ignored. Cruelty of foothold traps can also be mitigated by adding pads to the foothold trap's jaws.

- 5. **Cage traps for caracal**: The principles and guidelines applicable for foothold traps also apply for cage traps. Single door or double door cage traps are used. To improve selectivity and effectiveness the latter type of cage traps should preferably be placed next to a footpath.
- 6. **Cage traps for baboons**: These cage traps are effective provided the prescribed guidelines are followed. It is important to check the mesh size of the wire net covering, the

[387] Editor's Note: *Raphicerus campestris*.
[388] Editor's Note: commonly known as gin traps (Afrikaans – *slagysters*).

Version 5.0 – Do Not Use – Version 5.0

presence of a stopping mechanism and the number of cages used. The conditioning (taming by feeding) of baboons is the most important aspect of the trapping procedure, because the success of trapping depends largely on it.

This device/apparatus is ineffective in cases when:

- poison is strewn out,
- baboons are shot at or chased away, and
- poorly designed cage traps and/or poor setting techniques are used.

- 7. **Electric fences**: Predators can be excluded from a camp with the aid of a temporary or permanent fence that is correctly electrified. Currently an electric fence is the cheapest type of fence to erect and maintain. Electric fences is largely a new concept in the farming setup. The popularity of electric fences is increasing primarily because of the associated cost effective advantages.

The electricity bill is also very small.

Most of the modern types of energy-convertors are effective. The problems previously encountered with energy-convertors and isolator-material have been overcome.

An electric fence is not dangerous unless an animal is tied to it. The energy-convertor converts the electrical impulse to a three-millionth of a second, which renders it safe.

A conventional jackal-proof fence is ineffective because animals such as aardvark and porcupines dig holes underneath fences. Black-backed jackals and caracals also learn to climb over fences. Predator movement, especially in areas where the terrain is uneven, can be limited effectively by inserting two additional strands at the right positions, one above and another below next to the existing fence, and electrify them.

A standards livestock-proof fence can also be electrified cheaply by two or more appropriately positioned electrified strands.

The farmer should realise, if the fence is not 100% correct erected and maintained it could be a very ineffective fence. Meticulous compliance with instructions is necessary for success. A certain level of skills is required for correct planning. It is recommended that first a small lambing camp is electrified without incurring huge expenses in time and labour to acquire the skills for maintenance and understanding the problems. Thus, the farmer can evaluate the place of electrified fences in the farming setup. Several companies specialise in electric fences and are willing to offer demonstrations and assist in constructing the fences. Companies provide brief practical manuals with clear diagrams describing the operation of electric fences and instructions for its correct construction.

The viewpoint of nature conservation is that electric fences are the solution for the future because they reduce the use of other control methods and thereby not killing non-target animals. It also reduces the time spent otherwise to hunt problem animals.

- 7.1 <u>The way an electric fence work</u>: An electric fence consists of one or more strands which are isolated from the rest of the fence. When an animal simultaneously touched an electrified strand and an adjacent strand which acts as ground wire, it receives an electric shock of 3 000 to 8 000 V.
- 7.2 <u>Components of an electric fence</u>: The electric fence is illustrated in six figures. It consists of the following components: (1) power source, (2) energy-convertor, (3) strand, (4) isolator-material, and (5) earth wire (grounding).
- 7.3 <u>The power source</u>: The most convenient and best power source is the 220 V household power. Alternatively, 12 V batteries could be used. Most electric systems may operate for two weeks on a battery, but the life of a battery is shortened when it is regularly allowed to run flat. Therefore, change the batteries weekly. In remote areas, solar panels can be used to charge the batteries. The energy output of the solar panel should exceed that of the generator because the batteries cannot be charged at night while the charger is continuing to operate.
- 7.4 <u>The energy-convertor</u>: The energy-convertor is the power source for the electric shock. A range of energy-convertors is available for electrifying fences over distances of 1-2

Version 5.0 . HD de Waal . Version 5.0

km, 1-40 km and 1-100 km. The choice of the type of energy-convertor is determined by the distance of the fence to be electrified. The strength of the shock will determine whether the predator will evade it. An energy-convertor, with a current of at least 4 J, is recommended. It is advisable to purchase an energy-convertor that has greater capacity than what is needed immediately to allow for further extensions.

- 7.5 The fence: Two types of wire are generally used, namely a flexible pleated steel wire for temporary fences and a 2.6 mm galvanised steel wire for permanent fences. A flexible pleated steel wire has a life span of 2 to 3 years; it stretches and is only recommended for fences that are moved regularly. A galvanised wire does not rust where two different metals touch. Rust is a poor conveyor of electrical current. Poorly joining of wires also reduces the electrical current, therefore join the wires with a noose knot or wire clamps.
- 7.6 Isolator-material: The isolator-material forms only a small part of the electric fence, but is important because the maintenance of the fence depends on the type of isolator-material used. Porcelain isolators are the best because they last longest and are fire resistant. Plastic isolators are in order but the material should be resistant to ultraviolet breakdown. It must have an expected life span of more than 10 years in the sun. The space between the live strand and the pole to which the isolator is attached must be at least 1 cm. Plastic pipes used to be very popular as method of isolation. The disadvantages of plastic pipes as isolation is that it traps water and cause rusting. The new energy-convertors send impulses, which are capable to escape through hairline cracks in the pipe, and causes many short-circuiting. Ensure that sufficient stock is available and maintain the fence quickly.
- 7.7 The earth wire: Use a good earthing system, preferably a stainless steel rod (length 1 m, diameter 10-15 cm) which is imbedded in the ground near the energy-convertor in a mixture of bentonite and coarse salt. Erect the earth wire parallel to the electrified strand or use an existing strand in the fence and connect it to a stainless steel peg. Test the earth wire, because more than 80% of the problems can be traced back to a poor earthing system. Remember, the larger the capacity of the energy-convertor the larger the area required for the earthing pegs. Place these earthing pegs in areas that are permanently moist.
- 7.8 Position of electrified strands: Predators who are trying to dig or crawl underneath the fence can be stopped with a slanted support for additional electrified strands. Position the lower electrified and earth strands about 15 cm above the ground. It is effective for black-backed jackals, Cape foxes and vagrant dogs.

Predators may try to climb or jump over the fences but can be managed effectively by positioning another electrified strand on a slanted support on top of the fence.

Gates must also be made predator-proof by electrifying the gate itself and by filling sunken vehicle tracks in the road surface under the gate.

The easiest way to detect faults is by cut-out points on shorter sections of the fence. A voltmeter is used to test the currency along the fence line.

- 8. **Poison ejectors** (control of black-backed jackals): Poison ejectors are effective in:
  - areas with low black-backed jackal populations,
  - areas where poison baits are used,
  - areas where hounds are used to hunt,
  - cases where poison ejectors are left unattended in the veld, and
  - areas where old, ineffective cartridges are used.

This device is effective provided the instructions are followed. Important points are the choice of a spot to set it, the spacing of poison ejectors over the range of the black-backed jackal, selective baits/lures and avoiding the excessive use of non-target animal activities.

- 9. **Poison**: Poising is inappropriate and/or illegal when: (1) it is placed in a carcass and many non-target animals, especially vultures may be poisoned (illegal); (2) poison is placed in meat pellets (blocks of meat) and strewn opportunistically in the veld. non-target animals, especially birds of prey may pick up the poisoned meat pellets; (3) poisoned meat pellets which were not consumed are not removed within 12 hours from the veld; (4) poisoned meat pellets

Version 5.0 - File de Ward - Version 5.0

are not concealed under soil or plants ant in sight of birds (Illegal to leave it in the open in sight of birds); (5) too much poison is inserted in the meat pellets (the animal vomits it out and becomes shy for control methods); (6) too little poison is inserted in the meat pellets (the animal does not die and becomes shy of control methods); (7) any poison other than strychnine is used (Only strychnine may be used in Transvaal according to the act on Veterinary and Para-veterinary Professions, Act 19 of 1982, on prescription of a veterinarian and in other provinces a permit is required); (8) put out for cat species (cats seldom take bait); and (9) regularly used without intermittent use of other control methods.

Of all the control methods, poison unselectively killed most non-target animals because of its injudicious use. Poison can only be effective if it is used irregularly and only when hidden in meat pellets at the spot where the damage was caused and by considering the ranges of target animals.

- 10. **Poison collar**: The poison collar is the most selective control method. A small flock of sheep with poison collars are placed in the camp where the losses occurred. The other sheep must be removed from the camp for the duration of the control operation. Only the problem jackal or cat is eliminated. If the problem animal does not bite the sheep at the throat, other control methods must be employed. Poison collars are usually not effective for dogs because they do not bite at the throat; the sheep are assaulted and mauled at their bodies.

On 11 April 1991[389] Mr. Theuns Botha (Secretary: NPAPC) sent a circular to all members of the Problem Animal Policy Committee National. Attached was a document "*Acceptable Problem Animal Control Methods 1991*" which was compiled by Mr. G.P. Visagie, Transvaal Directorate Nature and Environmental Conservation. Members should bring the document with to the forthcoming because it would serve under point "10.1 Additional Chapter."

In a fax dated 12 April 1991[390] Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) wrote a handwritten note to Dr. Immelman (Roodeplaat Lab.): "*Dr. Immelman*[391] *– It is all that I could trace on what Uncle Greyling*[392] *had to say long ago regarding his solution of the problem.*" A 2-page document on the "Control of Jackals and Caracals" was attached. It stated that the methods used in the past to exterminate the black-backed jackals were trained packs of hounds, hunts by farmers from the area, poison and poison ejectors. All these methods helped to control black-backed jackals to some extent or to drive them to neighbours where they continued their massacres. The use of the poison, sodium fluoroacetate that was concealed in meat pellets to control black-backed jackals and caracals were described in detail.

The NPAPC met on Thursday 25 April 1991[393] at 10h00 in the Large Conference Hall, Jan Smuts Airport, Johannesburg. The meeting was attended by: Messrs. C.L. Greyling (Federal Problem Animal Control Association), M. van der Merwe (Federal Problem Animal Control Association), J.E. Lensing (CPA), P.E. Kingwill (NWGA of SA), A.P. Pretorius (NWGA of SA), W.J. Wessels (NWGA of SA), L.K. Joubert (NWGA of SA), T.F.J. Botha (NWGA of SA), G.D. Laws (Natal Parks Board), B.R. Wilkinson (NPA), D.J. Cook (Natal Parks Board), G. Nel (Oranjejag), T.F. Roux (Oranjejag), P.J.S. Olivier (MEC: PAO), Dr. G.F. Barkhuizen (PAO), Messrs. J.L. van der Walt (RPO), P.F. Hugo (RSC), G.P. Visagie (TPA), Dr. André Immelman (Roodeplaat Research Laboratories Pty Ltd). Apologies were offered for Messrs. D. Adams (NPA), P. Miller (MEC: NPA), N. Ferreira (PAO), P.J.J. van Rensburg (TPA). Excerpts from the minutes are cited:

[389] File WK 40/3, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[390] File WK 40/3, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[391] Editor's Note: Dr. André Immelman, Roodeplaat Research Laboratories (Pty) Ltd.
[392] Editor's Note: Ostensibly "*Oom Greyling*" was a colloquial reference to Mr. C.L. Greyling of the Transvaal Federal Problem Animal Control Association.
[393] File WK 40/3, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.

Version 5.0 - Hinde Wandl - Version 5.0

- Welcoming: The Chairman (Mr. Kingwill) welcomed all present, especially Mr. Len Joubert as member of the Committee and Dr. Immelman as a guest. Mr. Olivier (MEC) would later join the meeting and possibly Mr. A. Conroy of the Game Committee.
- Approving the Minutes: Mr. G.P. Visagie said he has submitted written changes to the minutes. According to the Secretary, it was not received. Mr. Visagie asked that the following changes be made:
- The Interprovincial Problem Animal Committee was not named the Interprovincial Problem Animal Research Committee.
- The Interprovincial Problem Animal Committee compiled the addendum, which he submitted.
- Mr. Visagie also protested that the Problem Animal Policy Committee requested specific information but then referred the issue to the Province again.
- The minutes of the meeting of 15 November 1990 was approved; moved by Mr. A.P. Pretorius and seconded by Mr. P.F. Hugo.
- Strategic Plan: The Chairman explained how the Strategic Plan would be handled at the meeting.
- Mr. G.P. Visagie emphasised that the Committee should concentrate on policy issues and refrain from getting involved in operational detail. He provided examples.
- After much deliberation the Committee realised it could perform an important function regarding Interprovincial policy and coordination. However, the Committee should state its mission and keep to it. The Committee should not get involved at the regional level or act prescriptive regarding provincial policies. However, the Committee could act as facilitator. It must be determined what the financial implications were for each of the operational objectives
- Thereafter the draft Strategic Plan was handled point for point. The changes were included in the annexure to the agenda.
- The meeting decided to form a working group, comprising the Chairman, Mr. P.E. Kingwill, Mr. G. Laws on behalf of the Provincial Administration and Mr. P.F. Hugo on behalf of the RSC, to convene before the next meeting and, based on the Strategic Plan, make specific recommendations regarding:
  - How the tasks should be executed (up and downward communication)
  - Who must execute it
  - What level of knowledge was needed regarding the different identified strategies
  - What the cost implications would be regarding the identified strategies, and
  - Who should be responsible for the funding of the strategies?

  This task [working] group would meet on 7 August 1991 in Port Elizabeth.
- **Communication**:
- Literature list: The Secretary was asked to compile a list of the brochures and other popular information, which were available different provincial administrations and make it available to the public and press.

Action

- Distribution of literature: The meeting noted that all inquiries received by the Secretary regarding literature or training material would be forwarded directly to the respective provincial administrations to respond.

To be noted

- Manuals: Information was available at two levels, namely formal information provided at training courses and informal information provided depending on the inquiry or specific need. The information was also provided to the popular media. The case should be addressed in the strategic plan. Farmers should be encouraged to use the sources.

Action

Version 5.0 - HD de Waal - Version 5.0

- On behalf of the **RPO**, Mr. J.L. van der Walt offered to explain in their publication the **Red Meat** which type of information could be ordered from the respective divisions of nature conservation of the provincial administrations.

Action

- Literature research: The meeting requested the working group to make a recommendation regarding the need to keep a databank for research and other scientific publications.

Action

- Articles - Problem Animals: The Chairman thanked everybody who contributed recently in publishing more popular articles on problem animals than in the past.

To be noted

- Letters – John Fair and Dr. A.E. Bowland: The persons were thanked for the information that served at the meeting.

To be noted

- **Control**:
- Proposals – Control methods: Mr. G.P Visagie was thanked for the discussion document that was prepared for the meeting.
- It was decided the working group should consider regarding the most effective way to disseminate the information. If there was no reference to poison in the document, it should be inserted that the use of poison was illegal if the Provincial Administration did not approve it.

Action

- **Training**:
- Register: Regarding presenting courses in problem animals, it was decided that only a list would be compiled of institutions who were prepared to present courses on demand.

Action

- Norms: After discussion, it was decided it would be inappropriate for the Committee to be responsible for the national registration of problem animal control organisations. Professional institutions should rather be encouraged to set mutual standards to which their members must comply. If those individuals or organisations were prepared to sign the "Code of Conduct" of the NPAPC, their information would be added to a list kept by the NPAPC.

Action

- Curricula: Answers were still awaited to see whether Agricultural Colleges would be willing to include training courses on problem animals in their curricula.

Keep on agenda

- Problem Animal Control: Mr. J. van der Walt referred to an annexure, which was handed out at the meeting. It was recommended Mr. van der Walt should inform the person[394] that the Committee identified training as very important and was planning to compile a list of persons involved with training and who could render services. If other persons could provide training, their contact details should also be provided to the Committee.

Action

- **Research and Development**:
- Alternative poison: Dr. A. Immelman (Roodeplaat Research Laboratories Pty Ltd) addressed the meeting on a provisional survey regarding the poison 1080. After further discussions it was decided;
  - Dr. Immelman would conduct the following project for the Committee: "*A literature review to provide clarity on the different aspects of 1080 and its poisonous traits*."
  - The cost of the project was R1 000 and would be shared equally by the NWGA and the RPO. A contact will be drafted and signed by the Chairman.

[394] Editor's Note: Mr. John D. Colborne.

Version 5.0 - H.J. de Waal - Version 5.0

- Dr. Immelman was asked to evaluate the existing poison collars and submit a report to the next meeting.
- Mr. P.F. Hugo offered to provide free of charge a poison collar to Dr. Immelman.
- Mr. Visagie will assist Dr. Immelman with the necessary tests and adaptation of the poison collar.
- The Secretary was requested to obtain the patent rights of the poison collar. However, Dr. Immelman could also obtain it via a friend.
- Dr. Immelman should be invited to the next meeting where the desirability to develop an alternative poison would be considered.
- If it were recommended, Dr. Immelman would be asked to submit a cost proposal for the development and the Committee could consider who to approach to fund the development.
- The Task Group must give special attention to the funding aspects.

Action: Dr. A. Immelman, Messrs. G.P. Visagie, P.F. Hugo, T.F.J. Botha, Members of Task Group

- Interprovincial Problem Animal Committee: The annexure to the agenda was addressed. With respect to further research on water resistant lures, the meeting noted with thanks the investigation. Although a few topics with a potential for research have been identified a lack of funds prevents immediate action. It will be retained on the agenda. **Keep on agenda**
- Use of levy money: Mr. J.L. van der Walt said statutory funds could not be used for problem animal control. The NGWA Natal Branch decided to investigate the possibility of some form of voluntary levy – it might be possible to collecting a voluntary levy with the assistance and cooperation of marketing agents.
- It was decided to wait for feedback from Natal and the RPO.
- The Chairman said several local clubs already existed where farmers make financial contributions. **Keep on agenda**
- **Code for application**:
- Additional chapter: At the previous meeting, it was requested that an additional chapter be included in manuals specifically warning against the dangers of the incorrect use of equipment and poisons. The input by the Free State and Cape Provinces served at the meeting. On behalf of Transvaal, Mr. Visagie said it would be kept in mind when new manuals were compiled. **To be noted**
- Further matters for the attention of the meeting:
- Dog taxes: The NWGA requested the Committee to investigate the merit of an arrangement that dog taxes being paid over to hunt clubs were stopped if such a club did not employ a registered hunter and the money was paid to the RSCs. It was decided the facts should be cleared with the person who raised the issue because it did not correspond with the information available to the Committee. **Action**
- Point of Discussion RPO/UFS Congress:
- The Association should be informed that the Committee was busy compiling an operational plan and that the issues mentioned in their letter would be included. The Policy Committee held the opinion that existing structures should be used maximally to combat problem animals. They should be asked to contact Dr. Barkhuizen.
- Regarding dogs around suburbs, the Committee accepted that it was a problem, but could do nothing about it. However, the issue should be kept on the agenda to ensure a policy decision would be taken in due course. **Action**
- Letter J.W.S. Helm: It was decided to provide the following answer to Mr. Helm:
- The Provincial Administration has no jurisdiction over the handling of hunt hounds. The Committee was aware of the serious problems Mr. Helm alluded to, therefore the issue would

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

remain on the agenda to be addressed at the next meeting; hopefully to find a solution and formulate a policy viewpoint regarding the specific problem.

- Mr. P.F. Hugo who was representing the RSCs on the Committee also noted the letter. The NWGA Natal Branch was conducting a project to try to introduce a voluntary levy at abattoirs and to use the funds to combat problem animals in the province. In the meantime, at the congresses of both the wool and meat industries, they voted against the principle to obtain statutory levies for this purpose. It was also in breach of the stipulations of the marketing act.

Action

- Date and venue for next meeting: It was decided to hold the next meeting in Pietermaritzburg on Friday 8 November 1991. The Natal Division of Nature Conservation would be the hosts. For those who would be flying it was recommended to land at Durban on the Thursday evening and then everybody can drive together by car to Pietermaritzburg. The principle was accepted to rotate the Committee's six-monthly meetings to allow each institution represented on the Committee to be the host.
- The meeting adjourned at 15h55.

On 6 May 1991[395] Dr. A. Immelman (Roodeplaat Research Laboratories Pty Ltd) wrote to Mr. Theuns Botha (Secretary: NPAPC) regarding the request to conduct a literature review for the Problem Animal Policy Committee. An official contract, Company Agreement with its clients, was attached. Dr. Immelman (Director) signed the contract on 30 April 1991 on behalf of Roodeplaat Research Laboratories (Pty) Ltd. The Company undertook to conduct the literature review on national and international databases. The information would be grouped to clarify the different aspects of 1080 and its lethal poisonous characteristics and should enable the NWGA to make a representation to the Department of Health. The fee for the contract was R1 000.00. Dr. Immelman thanked the NWGA for mandating the Company to conduct the research. The client was assured of the Company's compliance to the highest scientific standards.

In a fax dated 6 May 1991[396] Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) copied the letter of Dr. Immelman and the signed agreement with Roodeplaat Research Laboratories (Pty) Ltd to Mr. Gerhard Schutte (RPO). He also confirmed that hard copies of the documents were handed to Mr. Jan van der Walt (Manager: RPO). It would be appreciated if the RPO's cheque (R500.00) could be provided as soon as possible; the bearer should be "Roodeplaat Research Laboratories (Pty) Ltd".

In a letter dated 6 May 1991[397], Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA) informed Dr. A. Immelman (Roodeplaat Research Laboratories Pty Ltd) that final approval was obtained for him to continue with the literature review to clarify the different aspects of 1080 and its lethal poisonous characteristics. They were expecting a cheque for R500.00 from the Red Meat Producers' Organisation and, together with the signed contract and a cheque for R500.00 from the NWGA, will be sent the following week to Dr. Immelman. If the latter trusted the NGWA, he could start with the investigation to prevent any further delay with the project.

The Problem Animal Committee of the NWGA Natal & East Griqualand Branch met on Wednesday 15 May 1991[398] in the Welkom 1 Room[399], the Holiday Inn, Bloemfontein. Present

[395] File WK 40/3, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[396] File WK 40/3, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[397] File WK 40/3, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[398] File WK 40/3, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[399] Editor's Note: The meeting convened after the Mayoral Reception during the NWGA's National Annual Congress in Bloemfontein.

Version 5.0 – Hugo de Waal – Version 5.0

at the meeting were Messrs. A.P. Pretorius (Chairman), S.M. Bester, P.J. Naudé, J.A. Kemp, D.M. Williams and N.J. Vermaak (NWGA):

- The Chairman welcomed everybody present and acknowledged apologies for Messrs. T. Botha and K.R. Geldart.
- Brief overview for the issue: The Chairman explained the purpose of the meeting, namely to consider if it should be proceeded with efforts to generate funds for controlling vermin in Natal and East Griqualand by levy on sheep sold.
- It was decided unanimously to proceed with the efforts.
- Proposal to implement such a system:

(a) Sources to be levied: According to the Chairman, the Minister of Agriculture, Dr. Kraai van Niekerk, said statutory approval for such a levy would not be forthcoming. Therefore, farmers participating to such a system would have to contribute on a voluntary basis. After more deliberation it was decided: (i) to try and introduce a percentage levy of 0.5% per small livestock unit sold; (ii) that Mr. A.P. Pretorius should consult with Mr. Peter Miller (MEC; Natal) and see if the Provincial Administration could contribute towards the project; (iii) to enter in discussions with BKB and Stockowners regarding the possibility to deduct levies, show it on the settlement statements and pay it over to the Problem Animal Committee.

(b) Administration: After discussing the possible administration of the Levy Fund, it was decided: (i) to administrate such a Levy Fund centrally. The detail of such an administration would be resolved in due course; (ii) that Mr. A.P. Pretorius should contact Mrs. Whizz Laurence to provisionally provide secretarial services. He should negotiate any remuneration with her and liaise with the other Committee members for approval.

(c) How to approach institutions to ensure their participation: After discussing the matter it was decided to act in the following way: (i) The Provincial Administration should be contacted to confirm the number of Hunt Clubs in Natal, the specific areas where they operated and whether they were eligible for subsidies; (ii) The Chairman must then contact all Hunt Clubs to inform them about the broad goals of the Problem Animal Committee. In cooperation with the Hunt Clubs, it should be endeavoured to cover the whole of Natal and East Griqualand; (iii) Mr. A.P. Pretorius should also try to gain Mr. Peter Miller's (MEC) support for the project and request that Natal & East Griqualand be declared as open Hunt area. Furthermore, the involved of Mr. John Randal of Stockowners (Pty) Ltd and Mr. P. du Plessis of BKB with the project should also be negotiated; (iv) A meeting should be arranged with the Natal Problem Animal Committee to get all stakeholders involved with the action. It would also be resolved with the Natal Parks Board what control measures applied for the fencing of conservation areas and parks; (v) An information day should be held to inform all executive members regarding the progress that have been made in the following areas: Northern Natal – Mr. W.A. Human, Midlands – Mr. A.P. Pretorius, East Griqualand – Mr. S.M. Bester. In preparation for the meetings, Mr. A.P. Pretorius should compile a document with the necessary information; (vi) Executive members should hold meetings in their respective sub-branches and or Agricultural Unions and try to gain the support of all farmers in Natal and East Griqualand for the project.

(d) Commencement: Following deliberation, it was decided to implement the project not later than January 1992.

(e) Annual cost estimate: The meeting decided to explore the possibility to divide Natal and East Griqualand in 5 regions, with a hunter for each region. The boundaries for the regions would be determined in due course. Provisionally it was decided that, if possible, an amount of R30 000 per year should be allocated per region. Remuneration of hunters would be based strictly on performance. Potential hunters who may be considered were Mr. Conradie of Dundee and Mr. Potgieter of Normandien.

- Further action: The meeting decided the following issues were high priority and should be addressed before the Midyear Executive Meeting: (a) to recruit a secretary for urgently typing documents; (b) discussions with Mr. P. Miller (MEC); (c) a meeting of the Natal Problem

Version 5.0 Hoedewaal, Version 5.0

Animal Committee; (d) liaising with existing Hunt Clubs; (e) a list should be obtained from the Meat Board of all agents who were marketing sheep.

- The meeting was adjourned at 21h30.

On 20 May 1991, Mr. Theuns Botha (Secretary: NGWA of South Africa) received a letter from the Chief Directorate: Nature and Environment Conservation. The letter dated 28 March 1991[400], was signed by Mr. G.P. Visagie and was apparently delayed in the post. It referred to Mr. Botha's letter of 13 December 1990 and provided feedback on the minutes of the Committees' meeting on 15 November 1990 in Bloemfontein:

1. The minutes did not contain the comments of Mr. Visagie regarding the literature that was requested. Mr. Visagie objected that Policy Committee requested literature and refer it back to the Province.
2. Communication (4.3). The Chief Directorate has previously provided literature[401] (copy was attached).
3. Control. All manuals used or compiled by the Directorate emphasised the dangers regarding the incorrect application of control methods.
4. Training (4.4). The Directorate would present courses for farmers on demand provided there was sufficient interest. Dates would be arranged with interested persons.
5. Articles (4.6). The request was forwarded to the respective officials.

On 22 May 1991 Mr. P.E. Kingwill[402], President of the NWGA of South Africa, signed the contract (Project Title: Literature review to clarify the different aspects of 1080 and its lethal poisonous characteristics[403]) with Roodeplaat Research Laboratories (Pty) Ltd.

In a circular dated 11 July 1991[404] to all Members of the NPAPC, Mr. Theuns Botha (Secretary: NPAPC) attached a draft copy of the minutes of the meeting of 25 April 1991 at the Jan Smuts Airport, as well as a copy of the revised National Problem Animal Control Strategy. Members were reminded that the next meeting was scheduled for Friday 8 November 1991 in Pietermaritzburg, as the hosts of the Natal Division of Nature Conservation. Members were requested to submit written suggestions for any changes to the draft minutes by the end of July 1991. Members were requested to attend to those items marked for their action in the minutes. The agenda for the next meeting as well as particulars regarding the venue and other arrangements would be circulated during October. The revised strategy is cited:

"NATIONAL PROBLEM ANIMAL POLICY COMMITTEE
NATIONAL PROBLEM ANIMAL CONTROL STRATEGY[405]

1. Introduction

This document serves to place in broad perspective the following matters relating to problem animal control in South Africa.

- *The role and purpose of the National Problem Animal Policy Committee.*
- *The role and purpose of regional committees (described in the document) and their relationship with the Policy Committee.*
- *The main components for an effective problem animal control programme.*
- *The constraints and limitations of problem animal control in South Africa.*

[400] File TN 8/5/5/1 Nature Conservation Division of the Transvaal Provincial Administration, Pretoria (Inquiries Mr. P.J. Janse van Rensburg).
[401] Editor's Note: A list of 21 publications regarding problem animals in the Transvaal.
[402] File WK 40/3, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[403] "*Projektitel: Literatuursoektogte om die verskillende aspekte van 1080 en sy vergiftiging op te klaar.*"
[404] File WK 40/3, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[405] Editor's Note: The markedly revised draft (since the first copy of 19 October 1990) was also adapted and edited by the National Problem Animal Policy Committee at its meeting of 25 April 1991.

Version 5.0 . HO de Waal . Version 5.0

- *The extent to which any actions arising from problem animal control must be environmentally safe.*

2. Principles of Action

Conclusions already drawn at previous policy committee meetings have identified the following principles or parameters to which a strategy must be subordinate.

(a) The National Policy Committee's powers are strictly limited to those of an advisory nature.

(b) Problem animal control is, in the final analysis, the responsibility of the farmer.

(c) Problem animal control for the purposes of this strategy, is confined mainly to the [small] livestock industry and will only address areas which are referred to it from time to time.

3. Background

Problem animal control has a long history in South African small livestock farming environment. Efforts at control have tended to vary from crude to sophisticated, while responsibility for action has, depending on the regional authority, at various stages alternated between nature conservation agencies, quasi government specialist bodies (such as Oranjejag), farmer organisations and a combination of all these. Thus the intention behind the formation of the NPAPC was to bring together all the interested parties to forge a new unified approach to the question and to facilitate the actions required to bring about effective, responsible control.

4. Content of the Strategy

This strategy has five primary components:

Communication
Control
Training
Research and Development
Code of Conduct
Financing

The functions accorded to each of the three main tiers of responsibility – National, Regional and Local – are set out below.

5. Strategy

5.1 Communication

5.1.1 ***National Level****:*

The Problem Animal Advisory Committee to:-

(a) Establish a national policy for the control of small stock predators.

(b) Encourage cooperation between all interest groups at National and Regional levels, including:

- *Provincial/Regional authorities*
- *Interest Groups*
- *Control experts*
- *Nature conservation*
- *Farmers: S.A. Agricultural Union, Provincial Agricultural Unions. Provincial Wool Growers' Assoc. s*
- *Suppliers of control equipment*
- *Research groups.*

(c) Promote biologically acceptable control of problem animals through the media, so that a sound image is developed.

(d) Promote co-operation and gain support from national strategic decision makers.

5.1.2 ***Regional level****:*

(a) Establish Regional Problem Animal Co-ordinating Committees, which should include representatives from:-

- *Nature Conservation organizations*

Version 5.0 - HG de Waal - Version 5.0

- *Regional Wool Growers Associations*
- *Provincial/Regional authorities*
- *State Veterinary Dept.*
- *Universities*

(b) Promote farmers/nature conservation agency liaison and co-operation as the foundation of communication.

(c) Market acceptance of co-operation through selected media aimed at the small stock farmer, i.e.:

- *Regional Agricultural Unions publications*
- *Farmers' Weekly*
- *Landbouweekblad*
- *Conservancy Association Newsletter*
- *Popular magazines*
- *Television and radio*

(d) Promote control organisations where applicable.

(e) Promote local forums so that they act as communications 'link' between farmers and the regional committee, and for disseminating information to farmers.

(f) Collect statistics.

(g) Facilitate the advisory service to farmers on biologically acceptable control of problem animals.

(h) Disseminate information to local forums.

(i) Liaise with local forums.

5.1.3 ***Local level****:*

(a) Local forums should be established and promoted either by existing structures such as Farmer's associations, conservation committees, or control organisations etc.

(b) Disseminate information to end users via:

- *Agricultural Shows*
- *Meetings*
- *Conservancies*
- *Personal contact with individual farmers*
- *Local media*

(c) Liaison

5.2 Control

5.2.1 ***National level****:*

(a) The national Problem Animal Committee has no responsibility as to the control of problem animals.

5.2.2 ***Regional level****:*

The Regional Structures need to:-

(a) Promote the full range of proactive and reactive control techniques[:-

(b) Ascertain and promote realistic acceptance of a given % level of loss to predators as is the case with disease, abortion etc.

(c) Promote and establish the use of the full range of control techniques.

(d) Ensure that a regulatory procedure for the use of toxic material is in place in terms of the legislation.

(e) Establish reliable suppliers of predator control equipment and materials.

(f) Initiate Legislation at regional level that enables the Provinces to tailor legislation for their specific needs regarding application of controls.

(g) Financial.

5.2.3 ***Local level****:*

(a) Promote the objectives and principles in the Code of Conduct among end users so that biologically acceptable controls are implemented.

5.3 ***Training***

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

5.3.1 ***National level****:*

The National Problem Animal Policy Committee to:-

(a) Develop a National register of professionals and other experts available in predator control and their various areas of competence from information supplied by regional committees, and to disseminate combined information to all regional committees.

(b) Investigate the introduction of training modules in Agricultural colleges, Universities, and agricultural schools on control of problem animals.

5.3.2 ***Regional level****:*

Regional Problem Animal Committees need to:-

(a) Facilitate training programmes for Hunt Clubs and groups of farmers at regional and local levels.

(b) Ensure that a regulatory procedures for toxic substances are in place in terms of the legislation.

(c) Develop appropriate training manuals on predator control.

5.3.3 Local level:

(a) Arrange training for farmers or employees through liaison with Regional forums.

5.4 ***Training***

5.4.1 ***National level:***

The National Problem Animal Policy Committee to:-

(a) Co-ordinate and determine research needs via inputs from all the available expertise in this field.

(b) Solicit funding for identified research.

(c) Disseminate research findings to Provincial committees.

5.4.2 Regional level:

Regional Problem Animal Committees need to:-

(a) Provide National Problem Animal Committee with recommendations for research based on local needs.

(b) Disseminate research findings and training manuals to all regional interest groups

5.4.3 Local Level:

(a) Provide Regional Problem Animal Committee with recommendations for research.

(b) Formulate a normative policy approach how problem animal control should be financed.

(The following is only a preamble and must be formulated. Humane methods should also be included.)

5.5 ***Code of Conduct***

The inauguration of the National Problem Animal Policy Committee gives rise to a need for a code of conduct for all interest groups associated with the control of predators of small stock.

The National Policy Committee has undertaken to establish a register of professionals involved in the field of predator control. Concern was expressed that these individuals or groups should conform to a basic code of conduct. Further that this code should apply to all interest groups involved in the control of predators.

One of the basic functions of the code, which is voluntary in nature, is to serve as a point of reference, particularly until such time as regional authorities have established adequate regulatory infrastructures.

While a code of Conduct of Conduct may not solve all problems, never the less it should go a long way towards defining and clarifying the responsibilities of the various parties involved in the development, distribution and use of predator control equipment, and it should be of particular values in regions which do not yet have control procedures. Where there is a predator control regulator process in a region, the need for a code of conduct will obviously be less than where there is no such scheme in operation.

Version 5.0 - HD de Waal - Version 5.0

The Code of Conduct is not a simple document, mainly because the nature of predator problems and the diversity of control techniques require comprehensive consideration. Furthermore, the strong public pressure for the banning or restricting the use of some effective and much needed control techniques often stems from a lack of understanding of the many important issues involved. This document is designed therefore, also to provide the general public with some basic guidance on these issues.

5.5.1 ***Objectives***

The objectives of this Code are to set forth responsibilities and establish voluntary principles of conduct for public and private entities engaged in the control of small stock predators.

The Code describes the shared responsibilities of many segments of society, including Government, non-government groups, individuals, professionals, suppliers of equipment and international contacts; to work together so that the benefits to be derived from biologically acceptable and effective control of predators is achieved without significant adverse effects on people or the environment.

The Code addresses the need for a cooperative effort between national, regional and local groups to promote practices which ensure efficient and safe use of predator control equipment and materials while minimizing health and environmental concerns due to improper use.

The principles of conduct set forth by this Code:

Encourage the use of biologically acceptable and effective predator control techniques, including minimizing adverse effects on the environment.

Assist regions and organizations which have not yet established controls designed to implement quality and suitability of control techniques needed in that region.

Ensure that predator control techniques are used effectively for the reduction of small stock losses to predators and not used in an attempt to eliminate any predator species.

It is neither desirable nor practical for government agencies to resume direct responsibility for predator control on private farmland.

The role of government should be essentially advisory in character with emphasis upon supportive actions aimed at providing farmers with knowledge to combat predator problems through their own or professional resources.

Encourage the development of professionals in predator control who render a control and training service to farmers.

The Code is designed to be used, within the context of regional and national law, as a basis whereby government authorities, non-government organizations, manufacturers of predator control equipment, those engaged in the sale of these products, professional control operators and any private individuals, may judge whether their proposed actions and the actions of others constitute biologically acceptable practices

Definitions

Biologically acceptable *means the likelihood that a predator control method will cause minimum adverse effects on species or the environment generally.*

Effective control *means any biologically acceptable method which reduces the number of stock actually killed by predators to a point where it is no longer economical to continue with the programme.*

Control organisation *means any agency or formal grouping of farmers or individuals who pool resources for the control of predators using any recognized predator control method (Also informal).*

Interest groups *means any individual, organization, or company that has an interest in the control of small stock predators.*

Local level *means groups of individuals within local communities.*

Lures *means any formulation designed to attract predators to a trap location.*

Version 5.0 - HD de Waal - Version 1.0

National level *means interest groups drawn from throughout South Africa.*

Poison baits *means the use of a registered poison for the control of predators in a form that can be ingested as a single dose.*

Proactive *means methods employed to minimize the exposure or risk of predation prior to predation taking place.*

Professional *means entrepreneurs offering a predator control, training, or advisory service for financial gain.*

Reactive *means methods employed to reduce current stock losses due to predators.*

Small stock predator *means any species of mammal or bird capable of killing domestic stock.*

Toxic collar *means a device containing poison and affixed to the neck of domestic stock and designed to kill a predator in the actual process of killing stock.*

Regional level *means the geographical divisions accepted by the National Wool Growers Association.*

6. References

A. International Code of Conduct on the Distribution and Use of Pesticides. FAO. Rome. 1986. 28 pages.

B. AVCASA Code of Conduct. Agricultural and Veterinary Chemicals Association of South Africa. 1989. 11 pages.

C. Proposed Policy for the Regulation and Control of Wildlife Predators of Sheep in Natal. Unpublished Report. Natal Parks Board. 1988. 10 pages."

In a letter dated 11 July 1991[406], Mr. Theuns Botha (Secretary: NPAPC) referred Mr. J.C. Botha's (Senior Operations Officer, Free State Agricultural Union, Bloemfontein) letter (dated 20 February 1991) regarding problem animals and responded[407]:

1. Training of hunters: The issue was discussed by the Problem Animal Policy Committee and identified training in problem animal control as a strategic goal and in due course, a register would be compiled of institutions and or groups of people that can present official training.

Regarding training of farmers as hunters in the Free State, Oranjejag is prepared to evaluate representations and assist when possible. According to the Free State representative on the Committee, training would only be provided in the handling of hunting hounds and not training in the handling of poison.

2. Policy: training of farm workers: Dr. G. Barkhuizen, the Free State representative on the Committee, requested that he be contacted directly [telephone] regarding the province's policy applicable to the training of farm workers to set poison ejectors.

3. Ordinance: The Committee was informed it was not necessary to amend the Free State Ordinance to legalise private hunt clubs. Provided the Free State Division Nature Conservation issued a permit to a private person or institution, they could operate as hunters.

4. Financing: combating problem animals: The Committee was busy addressing funding requirements for combating problem animals in its Strategic Plan. A policy was not yet formulated in this regard. However, the Committee has decided in principle that the farmer was primarily responsible for combating problem animals and therefore the costs involved. Furthermore, the Committee held the view that government should also be co-responsible.

Mr. Botha would be kept informed regarding any policy decisions on financing.

5. Black Local Managements: The Provincial Administration has no jurisdiction over Black Local Managements and the policy they implemented regarding the keeping of dogs in black urban areas. However, the Committee was confident that as the RSCs develop, solutions would in due course be found for those problems.

[406] File WK 40/3, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.

[407] Editor's Note: Letter copied to Dr. G.F. Barkhuizen, Free State Provincial Administration.

Version 5.0 - HD de Waal - Version 5.0

Lastly, the Committee appreciated that the Free State Agricultural Union submitted the requests. It could not act prescriptive or execute policy but in the absence of uniform policies regarding problem animal control in the respective provinces it endeavours as facilitator to create overarching policy viewpoints for the country. Therefore, it was recommended the issues referred to in the letter be discussed with the local Provincial Administration's Division Nature and Environment Affairs. The Free State representative indicated he would welcome such discussions. Should there be any further questions the Committee may contacted again.

In a circular dated 11 July 1991[408], Mr. Theuns Botha (Secretary: NPAPC) reminded Messrs. P.E. Kingwill, P.F. Hugo and G.D. Laws about the meeting of the Task Group, scheduled for 7 August 1991 at 10h30 at the NWGA Offices, SA Wool Board Building, Port Elizabeth. They should inform Miss. Van der Westhuizen about the arrivals of their flight arrivals for arrangements to be picked up at the airport. It was suggested they book the return flights after 16h00 because many issues needed consideration. Mr. Greg Laws was working on the Strategic Plan and a copy would be provided either before the meeting, posted or by fax [contact telephone and fax numbers].

In a letter dated 11 July 1991[409], Mr. Theuns Botha (Secretary: NPAPC) reminded Mr. J.L. van der Walt (Manager: RPO) about specific items which were assigned to him during the Policy Committee's meeting of 25 April 1991:

1. Publish in an issue of Red Meat the list of institutions who were presenting courses regarding problem animals.
2. Inform the Company "Problem Animal Control" in writing that the Policy Committee viewed training as a strategic goal and plans to compile a national register of persons who were involved in training and could provide services. Provided the Company was prepared to endorse (sign) the Policy Committee's envisaged Code of Conduct, their detail would be included in the National Register.
3. Dr. Immelman asked to acknowledge with appreciation the R500 received from the RPO for conducting a literature review to provide clarity on 1080 and its poisonous traits. The NWGA paid the other half of the fee. When the report was completed, a copy would also be provided to the RPO.
4. In due time it would be appreciated to receive the RPO's answer regarding their policy viewpoint regarding the use of levy money or other voluntary contributions for combating problem animals.

In a circular dated 11 July 1991[410], Mr. Theuns Botha (Secretary: NPAPC) reminded Dr. G.F. Barkhuizen and Messrs. G.P. Visagie, G.D. Laws and J.E. Lensing about two issues which were assigned to them during the Policy Committee's meeting of 25 April 1991:

1. Referring to the recent decision, a name list of brochures and other popular information documents, which were available at their administrations, would be appreciated. This could be made available on demand to the media and farmers. Only the names of such publications were required and not the documents itself. Highly scientific and research articles should not be included in the lists.

   The Task Group would consider whether a data bank was needed for the literature.
2. It would be appreciated if the names of private institutions who were presenting training courses in their provinces could be provided. If the provincial administration were the only institution who provided training, the dates of courses during 1991/92 would be appreciated.

   The information was urgently needed <u>before</u> the end of July.

[408] File WK 40/3, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[409] File WK 40/3, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.
[410] File WK 40/3, Probleemdier Sub-komitee, NWKV.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

In a letter dated 20 December 1991[411], Mr. Johan Lensing referred to Mr. Nico Vermaak's (Secretary: NPAPC)[412] letter of 19 November 1991 regarding the Strategic Action Plan. Mr. Lensing suggested that somebody assisted in reformatting the text in the document from "Ventura" to MS Word[413] for easier editing. If need be the document could be provided to him on a "720mb" disk to implement the reformatting in Cape Town. (Handwritten notes by Nico Vermaak on the letter: 6 January 1992 – Johan Lensing advised by telephone that Andries Struwig or Christo Fabricius from Nature Conservation in Port Elizabeth could be contacted. / 8 January 1992 – Andries Struwig said he converted the text to MS Word and when convenient it will be provided to Johan Lensing.)

1992

In a letter dated 8 January 1992[414], Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) referred Mr. Johan Lensing to their telephone conversation. Mr. Andries Struwig of the Chief Directorate Nature and Environmental Conservation's Eastern Cape office in Port Elizabeth converted the text and when convenient the disk would be forwarded to Mr. Lensing in Cape Town.

In a letter dated 17 January 1992[415], Mr. D.J. Cook (Deputy Director: West) referred to his telephone conversation on 15 January 1992 with Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: National Problem Animal Committee) and attached a draft code of conduct for consideration by the Committee. Mr. Cook wrote: "*Whereas it had been intended to provide a comprehensive code detailing every aspect of use of control equipment etc., it was decided that the code should set down broad principles only, leaving the details to the operational procedures that will accompany all methods approved for control purposes by the committee*."

In a fax dated 5 March 1992[416], Mr. Peter Kingwill provided Mr. Nico Vermaak three pages of handwritten comments on the draft National Policy and Strategy for Problem Animal Control in South Africa. He suggested that the notes be made available to Mr. Johan Lensing with a view to incorporate it in the draft document before the Committee's next meeting. Mr. Vermaak arranged for the notes to be typed for further distribution.

In a letter dated 6 March 1992[417], Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) confirmed that Mr. Johan Lensing's input was received on 3 March 1992. Mr. Johan Lensing was thanked for his input in revising the daft Strategic Action Plan.

- The revised document, the contribution by Mr. D.J. Cook (Natal), as well as the revised sections 1 to 4 of the original plan, were distributed for comments to all members.
- A typed version of Mr. P.E. Kingwill's comments was also included for Mr. Lensing's information.
- If more comments were received these would be send to Mr. Lensing by not later than 30 March 1992.
- Recommendations by the Interprovincial Problem Animal Committee on the use of 1080 to control problem animals were received from Mr. Visagie (Transvaal). This, together with the policy views of the respective Departments on this topic, will be included in the

[411] File ANO 7/138, General Provincial Services Branch, Chief Directorate Nature and Environmental Conservation, Provincial Administration of the Cape of Good Hope.
[412] Editor's Note: Sometime prior to this letter, Mr. Theuns Botha was succeeded by Mr. Nico Vermaak as the Secretary: National Problem Animal Policy Committee.
[413] Editor's Note: This was at the initial stages of technological conversion from typewriters to word processing and many teething problems or rather lack of quickly acquiring a grip on new technology was to be expected.
[414] File WK 40 (b), NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee, Strategiese Plan.
[415] Natal Parks Board, Pietermaritzburg.
[416] File WK 40 (b), NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee, Strategiese Plan.
[417] File WK 40 (b), NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee, Strategiese Plan.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

annexure for the agenda of the meeting on 23 April 1992. Mr. Lensing was thanked for his input in making the information available to the Secretariat.

- Mr. Lensing was requested to provide before 23 March 1992 a list of possible accommodation close to the meeting venue in Cape Town. It would also be appreciated if information regarding the function on 22 April 1992 and the venue for the meeting could be provided to distribute it in time with the agenda to all members. A street map of Cape Town to guide members would also be appreciated.
- Hopefully, the final number of attendees for the function and the meeting would be provided before Monday 13 April 1992.

In a fax dated 31 March 1992[418], Mr. D.J. Cook (Deputy Director: West) provided Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: National Problem Animal Committee) an amended copy of the strategic action plan prepared by Mr. J.E. Lensing; a copy was also provided to Mr. Andre Pretorius[419]. Mr. Cook wrote: "*We have, in the amendment process, attempted to take what we considered the best of both the original document and Mr. Lensing's subsequent revision, in order to produce this version*." Mr. Cook regretted the delay in his submission.

In a fax dated 9 April 1992[420], Mr. B.R. Wilkinson (NPA) apologised to Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: National Problem Animal Committee) for the late submission, the MEC was involved in until the previous day with Extended Parliamentary Committee. Attached was a letter from Mr. Mr. R.T. Hardman (Secretary: NPA) which referred to Mr. Nico Vermaak's (Secretary: National Problem Animal Committee) circular letter of 4 March 1992 regarding reviewed edition: strategic plan. The letter stated, "*The Natal Provincial Administration supports the revised Code of Conduct (Annexure 2), Strategic Plan (Annexure 3) and the new National policy and strategy for problem animal control in South Africa (Annexure 1). Of major concern is paragraph 3.1 of Annexure A, which does not appear to cater for the situation in Natal where an Advisory Committee on Problem Animal Control has been formed and upon which a provincial representative serves, in addition to the Member of the Executive Committee charged with the responsibility of Nature Conservation. It might also be borne in mind that the other provinces may also wish to form similar structures and have their provincial representative also serve on the National Problem Animal Committee.*"

In a letter dated 13 May 1992 to Mr. Johan Lensing[421], Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: National Problem Animal Committee) referred to their telephone conversation on Monday 27 April 1992 and inquired when the final draft Strategic Plan would be available for distribution to members of the Committee. Mr. D.J. Cook indicated during a telephone conversation that there were no further comments on the draft that was provided to him by Mr. Lensing after the previous meeting. It would be appreciated if the final daft could be received as soon as possible to be distributed for final consideration to all interested parties.

On 18 May 1992[422], Mr. Johan Lensing (Cape Nature Conservation) referred to Mr. Nico Vermaak's (Secretary: NPAPC) letter of 13 May 1992, which he received earlier that day. Mr. Dave Cook returned the draft without any changes; the attached draft was the version that was agreed by them. Presumably, the document would be distributed to the participants for final comments and editing by Mr. Vermaak. Mr. Lensing emphasised that no further changes would be made to the document in anticipation of the final draft accepted by all before submitting it for approval to the Executive Committee of the CPA.

[418] File E 12/1 Natal Parks Board, Pietermaritzburg.
[419] Editor's Note: Mr. A.P. Pretorius (President Natal & East Griqualand NWGA Branch).
[420] File 2/4/255/1 Natal Provincial Administration, Pietermaritzburg (Inquiries B.R. Wilkinson).
[421] File WK 40 (b), NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee, Strategiese Plan.
[422] File ANO 7/138, Head Office, Cape Nature Conservation, Cape Provincial Administration, Cape Town.

Version 5.0 – Hoofdwerk Version 5.0

On 26 May 1992 the Free State Directorate of Nature Conservation paid R617 000 as subsidy to Oranjejag for the 1992/93 financial year; payment of the subsidy had been delayed until the budget for the financial year had been approved.

According to the Constitution of Oranjejag, dated June 1992, any user of land as defined in Article 36A of Ordinance No. 8 of 1969, and subject to the provisions of the Constitution, can apply for membership.

In a single page document dated 8 June 1992[423], Dr. G.F. Barkhuizen (PAO) commented on the Final Draft document to Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC). The document was very well drafted. On page 3, paragraph 2.2 changes were suggested to prevent confusion. On page 8, paragraph 3.3.3 it was suggested to insert "*Farmers must be trained to accept responsibility for limiting the number of dogs kept on their farms*" before "recommendations." He justified this proposal: "*Farmers in parts of the Orange Free State realised during the early 1980s that the local problem animal control organisations cannot control the damage caused by vagrant dogs. The farmers accepted responsibility themselves to limit the number of dogs on their farms and thus reduce livestock losses. The suggested system of licensing in the draft document will mainly be of assistance near towns, while most sheep farms are not close to towns and therefore not affected by vagrant dogs from towns.*"

In a single page document dated 9 June 1992[424], Mr. N.A. Ferreira (Directorate Nature and Environment Conservation, Orange Free State Province) informed Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) that his comments on the final Draft were communicated with his Director (Dr. G.F. Barkhuizen). The latter will provide the information at his discretion. He wrote that the Final Draft was well thought through.

In a fax dated 12 June 1992[425], Mr. P.J.J. van Rensburg (Hartbeeshoek Conservation Services, Chief Directorate: Nature and Environmental Conservation, TPA) provided some comments on the final draft to Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC). In addition to a few editorial suggestions, the following were emphasised: (1) page 6, paragraph 2.4.4.3 - A distinction should be made between primary and secondary poisoning. Secondary poisoning refers only to incidents when other animals eat an animal that was already poisoned by eating bait. Primary poisoning refers to incidents where an animal ingested the poison bait itself. Primary poisoning of non-target animals is a greater threat than secondary poisoning. (2) page 8, paragraph 3.2.2 – "Aim: to establish better cooperation..." With whom? Public? Representatives of the NPAPC? Other stakeholders?

In a faxed letter dated 19 June 1992[426], Mr. B.R. Wilkinson (NPA) referred to the circular minute dated 25 May 1992 and provided comments on the Final Draft: National Policy and Strategy for Problem Animal Control in South Africa to Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: National Problem Animal Committee). He wrote:

> "*The Natal Provincial Administration (NPA) has the following comment to offer in respect of the final Draft document.*
>
> *Firstly, with regard to paragraphs 2.1 and 2.2, as read with paragraph 2.2.5: This Administration merely seeks confirmation that the N.P.A.'s policy and practice of paying hunt clubs subsidies, paying bounties for problem animal hides and allowing the Hunt Clubs to levy a fee in declared hunting areas, which amounts to a commitment to shared*

[423] File WK 40 (b), NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee, Strategiese Plan.
[424] File WK 40 (b), NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee, Strategiese Plan.
[425] File WK 40 (b), NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee, Strategiese Plan.
[426] File 2/4/251/2 Natal Provincial Administration, Pietermaritzburg (Inquiries B.R. Wilkinson).

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

responsibility for financing problem animal control, between the Administration and the farmer in Natal, can be accommodated within the meaning of the said paragraph 2.2.5[427]*.*

Secondly, the N.P.A. seeks assurance that paragraph 2.4.4.3 of the Final Draft document will not be restrictively interpreted/applied by the other provinces to preclude the control method of administering a single lethal dose, by means of (for example) poison bait or poison collar, within legal parameters, from being ratified by the National Problem Animal Control Committee as an 'approved method' in terms of paragraph 2.4.3(d). The N.P.A. wishes, furthermore, to make it clear that it intends to promote the concept of the 'single lethal dose' as an important control method in Natal, under a system whereby the user becomes licensed to use the method and obtain poison baits, collars etc., only after the successful completion of an approved training course. Failing such an assurance, the N.P.A. is of the opinion that paragraph 2.4.4.3 will require an amendment.

Lastly, the N.P.A. feels that paragraph 3.2.3 requires a shift of emphasis. Although the N.P.A. is not opposed to the National Problem Animal Control Policy Committee opening channels for communication which could lead to dialogue between and it and environmental pressure groups or the animal rights movement, the initiative for such contact should come from these bodies, not from the National Problem Animal Policy Committee. This applies especially to animal rights groups, because the N.P.A. does not believe that dialogue between such groups and the National Problem Animal Policy Committee will amount to more than the Committee elucidating its policy and the animal rightists criticizing the policy, whatever that policy may be.

The reason for this is that animal rights groups are opposed to the rearing of farm animals for food or other purpose per se and believe that wilfully killing of animals, for whatever reason, can be linked to murder. Please see the attached copy of a pamphlet which explains the policy, objects and beliefs of the front for animal Liberation and Conservation of Nature (FALCON), which is submitted in support of this argument."

In a letter dated 19 June 1992[428] to Mr. P.E. Kingwill (Rietpoort, Murraysburg), Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) provided a 3-page summary of the written comments on the Final Draft National Policy and Strategy for Problem Animal Control in South Africa; these were received from committee members (Dr. G.F. Barkhuizen, Mr. P.J.J. van Rensburg and Mr. B.R. Wilkinson)[429] until 19 June 1992. The comments received by telephone on 18 June 1992 from some members (Mr. C.L. Greyling – Federal Problem Animal Control Association of Transvaal, Mr. A.P. Pretorius - President: Natal & East Griqualand NWGA Branch, Mr. W.J. Wessels – NWGA Producer member, Orange Free State and Mr. J.E. Pieterse – NWGA Producer member, Transvaal) were included in the summary:

- Page 3, par. 2.1 – The last sentence should be scrapped – "It means the user of services and goods for problem animal control must pay for it and the costs must be included in production costs." Motivation: "The producer can hardly include losses caused and expenses incurred for problem animal control under production costs, because it is not practically implementable. A farmer cannot claim higher prices for his animals at livestock auctions to recover losses caused by problem animals." Page 3, par 2.2 – subparagraph 2.2.5 should be higher up in order than subparagraph 2.2.1. Motivation: "The Provincial Authorities cannot simply shift the financial burden for problem animal control to producers, but instead should tackle this problem jointly in partnership with producers."
- Furthermore, Mr. Vermaak requested Mr. Kingwill's (Chairman: NPAPC) advise on three alternative procedures for the committee to handle the comments received on the Final Draft document, namely:

[427] Editor's Note: An exact copy of the original very long sentence.
[428] File WK 40 (b), NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee, Strategiese Plan.
[429] Editor's Note: The written comments have been cited previously in this document.

Version 5.0 - HD de Waal - Version 5.0

(1) Telephone conference: Telkom provided a telecon service for a maximum of six parties. The parties may comprise Mr. Kingwill (Chairman), Mr. J.E. Lensing (compiler of the final draft), Mr. D.J. Cook (compiler of the final draft), Mr. C.L. Greyling (on behalf of hunt organisation), Mr. A.P. Pretorius (on behalf of producers) and Secretariat (to take minutes). Only aspects addressed in comments by the committee members would be deliberated during the telecon. The costs were to be shared by the NWGA and the RPO. Decisions taken during the telecon could then be circulated again to all members of the National Committee.

(2) Special meeting of the NPAPC: Convene a special meeting for all members at a central point in the country, for example Bloemfontein. Purpose: to reach final consensus. Comment: probably not cost effective.

(3) Circular letter to all members of the NPAPC: Such a circular will contain all the comments received in a questionnaire with the request that members should indicate in a "vote" who are in agreement with a specific recommendation or not[430]. Thus, a majority of votes will determine the support for a recommendation. If votes were tied, the Chairman would have a casting vote. The final vote will serve as the Committee's decision.

- On Thursday 18 June 1992, a wreath and message of condolences were delivered to the widow of the deceased Dr. G.F. Barkhuizen on behalf of Mr. Kingwill and the Members of the Committee.

In a fax dated 13 July 1992[431], Mr. B.R. Wilkinson (NPA) provided some comments on the Final Draft document to Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) and wrote: Paragraph 3.2.3: Proposal re Objective: to create a climate of cooperation with environmental groups and establish free dialogue with animals rights groups. Proposals re Strategy and Responsibility were also offered.

In a fax dated 14 July 1992[432], Mr. B.R. Wilkinson (NPA) provided comments on the Final Draft document to Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) and wrote: "*The following is my English Translation of para 2.4.4.3 as it stands: 'The use of any chemical control method or any toxic substance in such a way as to cause secondary poisoning of non-target species, the environment generally or to pose a threat to public health.' The following is my suggested amendment to par 2.4.4.3: 'The use of any chemical control method or toxic substance in a manner not approved by the National Problem Animal Policy Committee, or in such a way that the risk of secondary poisoning of non-target species, of poisoning the environment generally, or of posing a threat to public health, is not minimized to the extent that is attainable through the method's correct application.'*"

In 14 July 1992[433], Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) provided Mr. Johan Lensing (Assistant Director: Nature and Environment Conservation) with a 7-page document: "*National Problem Animal Policy Committee / Comments on the recommendations received on the Final Draft of the National Policy and Strategy for Problem Animal Control in South Africa / Deadline 31 July 1992*[434]." In the cover letter, correction of two typing errors, which was brought to his attention by Mr. Petrus van Rensburg were also included. This could be corrected when the final comments were received and processed. The final recommendations would be send as soon as possible after 31 July 1992 for Mr. Lensing to incorporate the necessary changes if need be.

[430] Editor's Note: An example how to "vote" was included in the letter.
[431] File WK 40 (b), NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee, Strategiese Plan.
[432] File WK 40 (b), NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee, Strategiese Plan.
[433] File WK 40 (b), NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee, Strategiese Plan.
[434] Editor's Note: Apparently the 7-page document was similtaneosly distributed to all the Committtee Members.

Version 5.0 Hilton de Waal Version 5.0

In a circular dated 27 August 1992[435], Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) wrote:

"*Dear Committee Member*

Commentary: Final Concept: National Policy and Strategy

For your cognisance, please find attached hereto the processed commentary on the recommendations for the Final Concept of the National Policy and Strategy for Problem Animal Control in South Africa, as received from members up to and including 18 August 1992[436].

These commentaries are at present being included in the Final Concept Document, and on completion will be referred to:

a) The Executive Committees of the various Provincial Authorities;
b) The Natal Parks Board;
c) The Executive Board of the Regional Services Councils of South Africa;
d) The Action Committees of the RPO and the NWGA.

Any comments or recommendations from the above organisations, will be submitted to the National Problem Animal Policy Committee during the forthcoming meeting in Pretoria.

Meeting: National Committee

At its recent meeting on 23 April 1992 in Cape Town, the National Committee resolved on alternative dates for a next meeting, namely 3 November and if that is not possible 18 November 1992.

As a result of a delay in the response to receive comments on the recommendations for the Final Draft of the Policy Document, as well as circumstances preventing some members to attend the next meeting on 3 November 1992, it was decided in consultation with Mr. P.E. Kingwill to hold the next meeting on Wednesday 18 November 1992 in Pretoria.

It was trusted this arrangement would suit all.

Further detail of the meeting will be communicated in due course."

In a letter dated 27 August 1992[437], Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) provided feedback on the Final Draft: Strategic Plan to Mr. Johan Lensing (Assistant Director: Nature and Environment Conservation) and wrote:

- Enclosed the processed commentary on the recommendations for the Final Draft of the National Policy and Strategy for Problem Animal Control in South Africa, as received until Tuesday 18 August 1992.
- The comments were referred to Mr. P.E. Kingwill. He requested that the recommendations[438], in each case with a majority vote, be incorporated in the final draft.
- The 'Final' Draft can then be returned to the Secretariat for distribution to:
  - The Executive Committees of the Respective Provincial Authorities;
  - The Board of the Natal Parks Board;
  - The Executive Board of the RSCs of South Africa;
  - The Executives of the RPO and the NWGA.

P.S.: Mr. Peter Kingwill's father died suddenly on Sunday 23 August 1992.

In a letter dated 14 September 1992[439], Mr. Nico Vermaak (Assistant Manager: NWGA) conveyed recommendations of the NWGA Cape Province Branch regarding the Strategic Policy Document to Mr. P.E. Kingwill (Chairman: NPAPC).

[435] File WK 40 (b), NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee, Strategiese Plan.
[436] Editor's Note: The 5-page document was the processed feedback received from 15 of 24 Committee Members.
[437] File WK 40 (b), NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee, Strategiese Plan.
[438] Editor's Note: Of the eight recommendations asked to vote on, 1 recommendation was accepted unanimously by 15 to 0 votes, 5 recommendations by 14 to 1 votes and 2 recommendations by 13 to 2 votes.
[439] File KA 4.3, National Wool Growers' Association, Cape Province Branch. Port Elizabeth.

Version 5.0 Hio de Waal - Version 5.0

- At its recent Executive Meeting, the Branch recommended that representatives of the National Parks Board and the respective self-governing areas be nominated as members of the Committee, because many problems were experienced in the control of problem animals from the areas of responsibility of the Parks Board and the self-governing areas.
- It was suggested these proposals might be discussed at the forthcoming meeting of the NPAPC.

In a letter dated 14 September 1992[440], Mr. Johan Lensing (Assistant Director: Nature and Environment Conservation) referred to Mr. Nico Vermaak's (Secretary: NPAPC) letter of 27 August 1992 [File WK 40 (b)] regarding the Problem Animal Policy and Strategic Plan and wrote:

- As requested, the final version of the document (13 pages) was attached.
- It was deduced that Mr. Vermaak would provide the official version to the Executive Committee of the Cape Province, therefore he will not submit it himself until the copy was received from Mr. Vermaak. If a copy of Mr. Vermaak's submission (letter) to the Executive Committee was provided. Mr, Lensing offered to assist in speeding up the process.
- Attached was a copy of an article with some ethical principles that appeared in the Magnum (a periodical) and should be for the cognisance of everybody. It was requested that it be presented for information at the next meeting.

In letters dated 21 September 1992[441], Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) provided Mr. G.P. Visagie (Director: Nature and Environmental Conservation, Transvaal Province), Mr. J.E. Lensing (Assistant Director: Nature and Environment Conservation, Cape Province) and Dr. L.P. Stolz (Director: Nature and Environment Conservation, Orange Free State Province) with the final draft National Policy and Strategy for Problem Animal Control in South Africa, which was compiled by the NPAPC:

- National Policy: Submission to Executive Committee.
- All recommendations and proposals received from committee members until 18 August 1992 were incorporated.
- As decided at the meeting of 23 April 1992, the attached document must be submitted to the Executive Committee for approval and comments.
- It would be appreciated if the Executive Committee's recommendations could be received no later than 30 October 1992 for inclusion in the agenda of the National Committee's meeting on 18 November 1992.

In a letter dated 21 September 1992[442], Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) provided Mr. D.J. Cook (Deputy Director: Western Area, Natal Parks Board) with a copy of the final draft National Policy and Strategy for Problem Animal Control in South Africa, which was compiled by the NPAPC:

- National Policy: Submission to Executive Board.
- All recommendations and proposals received from committee members until 18 August 1992 were incorporated.
- As decided at the meeting of 23 April 1992, the attached document must be submitted to the Board for approval and comments.
- It would be appreciated if the Board's recommendations could be received no later than 30 October 1992 for inclusion in the agenda of the National Committee's meeting on 18 November 1992.

[440] File ANO 7/138, Head Office, Cape Nature Conservation, Cape Provincial Administration, Cape Town.
[441] File WK 40 (b), NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee, Strategiese Plan.
[442] File WK 40 (b), NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee, Strategiese Plan.

Version 5.0. NO de Waal - version 5.0

In letters dated 21 September 1992[443], Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) provided Mr. G. Schutte (Manager: RPO of South Africa) and Mr. T.F.J Botha (Manager: NWGA of South Africa) with the final draft National Policy and Strategy for Problem Animal Control in South Africa, which was compiled by the NPAPC:

- National Policy: Submission to Executive Committee.
- All recommendations and proposals received from committee members until 18 August 1992 were incorporated.
- As decided at the meeting of 23 April 1992, the attached document must be submitted to the Executive Management for approval and comments.
- It would be appreciated if the Executive Management's recommendations could be received no later than 30 October 1992 for inclusion in the agenda of the National Committee's meeting on 18 November 1992.

In a letter dated 21 September 1992[444], Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) provided Mr. P.F. Hugo (RSCs of South Africa) with a copy of the final draft National Policy and Strategy for Problem Animal Control in South Africa, which was compiled by the NPAPC:

- National Policy: Submission to Executive Board.
- All recommendations and proposals received from committee members until 18 August 1992 were incorporated.
- As decided at the meeting of 23 April 1992, the attached document must be submitted to the Executive Board for approval and comments.
- It would be appreciated if the Executive Board's recommendations could be received before no later than 30 October 1992 for inclusion in the agenda for the National Committee's meeting on 18 November 1992.

In a letter dated 27 September 1992[445], Mr. D.J. Cook (Deputy Director: Western Area, Natal Parks Board) acknowledged receipt of Mr. N.J. Vermaak's (Secretary: National Problem Animal Committee) letter of 21 September 1992 and the enclosed National Policy and Strategy for Problem Animal Control in South Africa. Regarding the National Policy: Submission to Executive Board, he wrote:

"*My Board associates itself with the fundamental principles underlying this document but, since it has no direct responsibility for the control of problem animals on land supporting small livestock in Natal, would prefer to leave the question of acceptance to the authority concerned, the Natal Provincial Administration, through the Problem Animal Advisory Committee.*"

On 29 September 1992[446], Mr. G.P. Visagie (Director: Nature and Environmental Conservation) referred to Mr. Nico Vermaak's (Secretary: NPAPC) letter of 21 September 1992 and said unfortunately it was not possible to approach the Executive Committee before the deadline set by Mr. Vermaak.

In a letter dated 5 October 1992[447], Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) provided Mr. B.R. Wilkinson (Senior Administrative Officer: NPA) with a copy of the final draft National Policy and Strategy for Problem Animal Control in South Africa, which was compiled by the NPAPC:

- National Policy: Submission to Executive Committee.

[443] File WK 40 (b), NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee, Strategiese Plan.
[444] File WK 40 (b), NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee, Strategiese Plan.
[445] File WK 40 (b), NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee, Strategiese Plan.
[446] File TN 1/11/4/65 Chief Directorate: Nature and Environmental Conservation Division of the Transvaal Provincial Administration, Pretoria.
[447] File WK 40 (b), NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee, Strategiese Plan.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

- All recommendations and proposals received from committee members until 18 August 1992 were incorporated.
- As decided at the meeting of 23 April 1992, the attached document must be submitted to the Executive Committee for approval and comments.
- It would be appreciated if the Executive Committee's recommendations could be received before or on 30 October 1992 to be included in the agenda for the National Committee's meeting on 18 November 1992.
- An English version of the Policy Document will be produced when the Final Draft has been finalised.

On 5 October 1992[448], Mr. P.E. Kingwill (Chairman: NPAPC) wrote the following to Mr. John Fair (NWGA Extension Office, Harrismith):

"*Dear John*

Action Plan: Problem Animal Policy Committee

Nico Vermaak and myself have to present some ideas re the development of an Action Plan to the Problem Animal Policy Committee in November. As a result of particular interest in this subject, I would appreciate your ideas on the subject.

The various strategies in the plan need to be translated into more specific actions and delegated to specific role players, for example:

Strategy 3.4.1:

Action	*Responsibility*
1. Establish need for number and venues for training courses per region	*Regional Extension Committees*
2. Establish availability of and cost of instructors	*Regional NWGA Extension Officer*
3. Motivate recruitment of candidates for course	*Regional NWGA Extension Officer*
4. Arrange venue and organise course and candidates	*Local Farmers' Association*
5. Report back to Regional Committee on success rate of candidates	*Local Farmers' Association*
6. Plan future strategy for region	*Regional Committee*
7. Report progress and problem areas to national Committee	*Regional Extension Officer*

Strategy 3.2.4:

Action	*Responsibility*
1. Plan Regional Communication Campaign	*Regional Extension Committee*
2. Inform farmers' Associations	*Extension Officer or Regional Committee appointee*
3. Invite Nature Conservation Officials to speak at meetings	*Local Farmers' Associations*

Etc. etc.

This Strategic Plan won't be worth its paper unless we can delegate responsibility very specifically and monitor progress effectively.

Many Thanks.

Kind Regards

Dictated by P.E. Kingwill[449] and signed on his behalf by Nico Vermaak: Secretary National Problem Animal Policy Committee."

[448] File WK 40 (b), NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee, Strategiese Plan.

[449] Editor's Note: Mr. Peter Kingwill wrote the letter by hand and faxed it from his hotel to Mr. Vermaak, while on a business trip in Tokyo, Japan.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

In a letter dated 8 October 1992[450], Mr. G.M. Schutte (Manager: RPO) wrote to Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) regarding the National Policy and Strategy for Problem Animal Control in South Africa:

- At its meeting on 23 September 1992, the RPO's Small Livestock Committee noted with appreciation the National Policy and Strategy for Problem Animal Control in South Africa and requested that the NPAPC be congratulated for the thorough execution of the task.
- The RPO's Small Livestock Committee recommended that in paragraph 2.3 of the Document, namely the "Aim of Problem Animal Control", a sentence be inserted dealing with "preventative actions at the early stage".
- The purpose with the recommendation was that judicious extermination of problem animals should be implemented before the problem is allowed to escalate.
- It was requested to please convey the message of congratulation and appreciation, as well as the recommendation, to the NPAPC.
- Furthermore, the members of the Small Livestock Committee as well as the provincial RPO's have been provided with the National Policy and Strategy for Problem Animal Control in South Africa and it was indicated that they should feel welcome to submit input any time.

A 24-page document, named "*Execution of Strategic Action Plan*"[451] and dated 10 October 1992 was circulated to members of the NPAPC prior to the meeting arranged for 18 November 1992. The preface stated:

"*Introductory Remarks*

The Plan contained in the National Policy Document outlines the strategies needed to realise the objectives of the National Problem Animal Policy Committee and execute its functions.

To make the stated strategies practical implementable it is necessary to identify specific actions. Each action must be assigned to a specific role player who must execute it within a specific period and then report the progress made to the National Policy Committee.

The Document describes the objectives of the Strategic Action Plan as well as the actions, which must be launched in each case.

This is just a working document and was compiled to stimulate thought processes with a view to take meaningful 'action-decisions' at the meeting on 18 November.

You are welcome therefore welcome to formulate in advance your own actions for each objective to provide input at the forthcoming meeting when the Execution Plan will be drafted."

In a fax dated 12 October 1992[452], Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) referred Mr. G.P. Visagie (Director: Nature and Environmental Conservation, Transvaal) to their telephone discussion on 6 October 1992 regarding the National Policy and Strategy: Problem Animals as compiled by the NPAPC. He inquired about the Department's recommendation to the Transvaal Executive Committee regarding the National Policy Document.

In a fax dated 13 October 1992[453] to Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC), Mr. G.P. Visagie (Director: Nature and Environmental Conservation) wrote that the Chief Directorate will recommend to the Administrator-in-Executive Committee to accept the National Policy and Strategy.

In a letter dated 14 October 1992[454], Mr. G.M. Schutte (Manager Red Meat Producers' Organisation) advised the four provincial RPO's about the National Policy and Strategy for

[450] File 14/1/8 Red Meat Producers' Organisation, Pretoria.
[451] File WK 40 (b), NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee, Strategiese Plan.
[452] File WK 40 (b), NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee, Strategiese Plan.
[453] File WK 40 (b), NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee, Strategiese Plan.
[454] File 14/1/8 Red Meat Producers' Organisation, Pretoria [Inquiries F.J de Jager].

Version 5.0 - Rio de Waal - Version 5.0

Problem Animal Control in South Africa that was in the process of being finalised on 18 November 1992 by the NPAPC. Attached was a copy of the draft document (13 pages) being circulated in advance for comments. When the policy and strategy was finalised a copy of the final document would be distributed.

On 19 October 1992[455], Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: National Problem Animal Committee) wrote to Mr. D.J. Matthee (Executive Officer: Algoa RSC) regarding the Final Draft: National Policy and Strategy for Problem Animal Control in South Africa:

- Reference was made to their telephone discussion on Monday 19 October 1992.
- At Mr. Matthee's request the final draft National Policy and Strategy for Problem Animal Control in South Africa, which was compiled by the NPAPC, was attached.
- Mr. P.F. Hugo of the Breërivier RSC, and representative of the RSC's Association on the National Policy Committee, requested that a copy of the Final Draft Document be provided for submission to the National Council on 28 October 1992.
- The Secretariat would appreciate to receive the Board's recommendations on the Policy Document before or on Friday 13 November 1992, in time to be presented to the National Policy Committee at its meeting on 18 November 1992.
- He was welcome to contact Mr. Vermaak or Mr. Hugo for any inquiries.

In a fax dated 20 October 1992[456], Mr. John Fair (Wolex Co-Operative, Harrismith) gave detailed feedback to Mr. P.E. Kingwill (Chairman: NPAPC) regarding the input requested in a letter dated 5 October 1992, and wrote:

"*Dear Peter,*

Action Plan Animal Policy Committee

Thank you for the invitation to present some ideas on your action plan. They are as follows:

1. ***National Problem Animal Control Forum***

Having read through the final concept of the National Policy and Strategy for Problem Animal Control in South Africa, I feel strongly that the Golden Gate Forum that this office is planning for the 4th and 5th May, 1993, should be held under the auspices of the National Policy Committee. My reasons for believing this are: (1) Our plans fit so perfectly with NPAPC's objectives and functions. (2) The success of the NPAPC's future action plans will be largely influenced by this body being recognised as the central directing and 'controlling' body. The Golden Gate Forum will, I believe, do a lot to help establish this perception.

I plan to have a concept programme for the Golden Gate Forum out by next week and will fax it to you for your comment. If needs be, a special committee can be set up to handle the Forum.

2. ***Action Plan***

Strategy 3.4.1

Action 1.

I agree that the Regional Extension Committees are the logical place to launch actions, but my experience is that members on these committees do NOT readily recognise the need for promoting PAC training courses. (It is not a political issue!) Pieter and I have actually had to 'fight' hard to get the working committees (Woolledsheep Task Teams) to accept our plans to hold courses.

An interesting aspect of this problem is that some farmer representatives on these committees are themselves not fully convinced about the value of courses.

There is thus, unfortunately, a good chance of running into a dead-end street there. To avoid this I suggest the following:

[455] File WK 40 (b), NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee, Strategiese Plan.
[456] File WK 40 (b), NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee, Strategiese Plan.

Version 5.0 - Ilse de Waal - Version 5.0

A publicity/information campaign designed to make farmers aware of the benefits to be derived from attending – and sending their staff on – courses. Said more simply, I might also add that once Pieter and I got past the Wool Task Teams we had to work hard to 'sell' the courses to farmers. Only once they had attended did they perceive and experience the real value of them.

To get action plans passed by the Regional Committees, I suggest that you first identify one or two members in each Regional Committee to motivate the issue and supply them with all the necessary 'ammunition' to present your case very strongly.

Action 2.

I think that it is a good idea to collect all relevant information on possible instructors. I believe that we also need to get the following information:

- *Synopsis of contents of course*
- *Rating of proficiency*

Actions 3 and 4

I also agree that the local extension officer, Dept. or Wolex, should take the initiative in getting courses set up. This can be facilitated by working through the local farmers' association.

One advantage of farmers associations taking responsibility for the running of a course is that they normally have the financial backing to ensure their financial viability.

Actions 5, 6 and 7

I believe that it is of vital importance to first establish a very prominent link between the NPAPC and Regional Committee's (RC's). By this, I mean that a member of the NPAPC should attend at least on RC meeting per year and see to it that PAC is on the agenda. Once this has been done the necessary flow of information can take place by appointing a regional representative.

I think that it will be necessary for the NPAPC to give the RC's very positive and specific guidance in dealing with the problem. (Many members on the RC's have only a vague idea of what is required!).

Strategy 3.2.4

Actions 1, 2 and 3

I certainly agree with the importance of this strategy – without good communication all plans are doomed to fail. Once again, I see the need for a major publicity campaign to precede this action.

It will, I believe, also be necessary to provide the regional extension committee's and officers with useful information – practical and to the point stuff – on PAC. (Give them good material and they will run with it – give them poor material and the action will go no further.) Putting the right material together will require a special action.

3. ***Selective and prioritized approach***

I agree with you that the strategic plan won't be worth the paper it is written on unless we can delegate responsibility and monitor progress. But, first of all, we have to get busy people to accept the task and with this in mind I would like to stress the need to prioritize actions and be selective in their application.

I trust the above comments will be of value to you.

Kind regards

John Fair."

In a letter dated 26 October 1992[457], Mrs. de Welzim (on behalf of the Chief Directorate Nature and Environmental Conservation), referred Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) to his letter (WK40) and attachment, dated 21 September 1992:

[457] File ANO 7/138, Chief Directorate, Nature and Environmental Conservation, Cape Provincial Administration, Cape Town (Attention Mrs. H.E. de Welzim).

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

- The process of submission to the Administration's Executive Council was underway, but meeting the deadline of 30 October 1992 for feedback on the Administration's recommendations, as suggested by Mr. Vermaak, would not be feasible.
- As soon as the outcome became available, it would be communicated speedily.

In a fax dated 26 October 1992[458], Mr. B.R. Wilkinson (NPA) gave feedback to Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: National Problem Animal Committee) regarding the National Policy and Strategy for Problem Animal Control in South Africa. He wrote:

"*The Administrator-in-Executive Committee of the Natal Provincial Administration has approved and adopted as NPA policy the National Problem Animal Policy Committee's National Policy and Strategy for Problem Animal Control in South Africa in terms of Executive Committee Resolution No. 863 dated 21 October 1992.*"

On 26 October 1992 the Orange Free State Province Administration approved payment of R375 000 as subsidy to Oranjejag for the period 1 January to 31 March 1993 to make good the shortfall in its budget for the 1992/93 financial year.

In a fax dated 29 October 1992[459], Mr. John Fair (Wolex Co-Operative, Harrismith) informed Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: National Problem Animal Committee) that he has conferred with Mr. Peter Kingwill (Chairman: NPAPC) regarding the tentative programme and attached an altered programme[460]. He wrote that Mr, Vermaak could proceed with his plans:

"***Golden Gate***
Problem Animal Control Forum / Probleemdierbeheer Forum
4 – 5 May/Mei 1993
(Tentative Programme/Voorlopige Program)

Tuesday 4th May
08:00 ***Registration***
Tea/Coffee
10:30 Opening Address
Mr Peter Kingwill: Chairman NPAPC

1st Session
Provincial ordinances concerning problem animals and the land user
Session Chairman: Danie Visser

11:00 ***Natal Ordinances***
Mr Peter Miller: MEC for Natal
11:20 ***Vrystaat Ordinansies***
Mnr Pieter Olivier: LUK vir OVS
11:40 ***Cape Ordinances***
Mr Johan Lensing: Deputy Director Cape Conservation
12:00 ***Transvaal Ordinansies***
Mnr Vis Visagie: Direkteur Spesialiteits's Dienste Natuurbewaring Transvaal
12:20 ***Debate***
13:00 ***Middagete***

2de Sessie
The ecology of problem animals
Chairman: Johan du Plessis

[458] File WK 40 (b), NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee, Strategiese Plan.
[459] File WK 40 (b), NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee, Strategiese Plan.
[460] Editor's Note: This verbatim version of the programme replaced the tentative programme which Mr. Fair faxed on 26 October 1992 to Mr. Vermaak.

Version 5.0 - HD de Waal - Version 5.0

14:00 *This session will be planned at the NPAPC Meeting to be held in Pretoria on 18th November '92*
15:00 ***Tee/Koffie***

3rd Session
Control with the livestock protection collar
Session Chairman: Smiley de Beer

15:30 ***International experience with the Livestock Protection Collar (LPC)***
International Guest Speaker: Mr Roy McBride
Ranchers' Supply Incorporated, Texas, USA
16:10 ***Namibian experience with the LPC***
Johan Laubscher: Farmer, Mariental
16:30 ***Ek boer saam met jakkals***
Hansie Spies: Wolskaapboer, Harrismith
16:40 ***Probleme met verkeerde gif***
Neil Ferreira – Natuurbewaring OVS
16:50 ***Debateer***
17:30 ***Sessie eindig***
18:30 ***Wildsbraai***

Wednesday 5th May

4th Session
The effective use of electric fencing
Session Chairman: Gerald van Heerden

08:00 ***Critical success factors is the erection and use of electric fencing***
Maurice Williamson: Sales Director Gallagher Poldenvale
08:30 ***Keeping problem animals out***
Duncan Heard: Control nature Conservation, Bellville
08:50 ***Beskerming van skape op die Potchefstroom Landboukollege***
Martinus Postma: Navorsings Tegnici
09:00 ***How we reduced lamb losses to jackal***
Dave Sympson: Farmer, Kokstad
09:10 ***Elektrieseheining keer die Vrystaat Jakkals***
Andre Kok: Boer, Marquard
09:20 ***Debate***
09:45 ***Tea/Coffee***

5de Sessie
Sukses met slagysters
Sessie Voorsitter: Gawie van Wyk

10:15 ***'n Filosofiese benadering***
Peter Schneekluth: Professionele Jagter, Prins Albert
10:45 ***How I am beating the Jackal on my Karoo farm***
John Bell: Farmer, Colesburg
11:00 ***Slagyster kursus betaal dubbel en dwars***
HW Wessels: Boer, Harrismith
11:10 ***Debateer***
11:40 ***Sessie eindig***

6de Sessie
Vanghok vir rooikat
Sessie Voorsitter: Jan du Toit

11:45 ***My ervaring***
Johan Strydom: Professionele Jagter, Warden
12:05 ***Debateer***

Version 5.0 - Hoa Wad - Version 5.0

12:20 ***Sessie eindig***

7th Session

Night shooting

Session Chairman: Koos Cloete

12:25 ***The technique and equipment for successful night shooting of vermin***

John Colborne: Professional Hunter, Transvaal

12:45 ***Debate***

13:00 ***Session ends***

Lunch

8th Session

Poison drop-bait

Session Chairman: Ariël Hugo

14:10 ***The correct use of poison drop-bait***

Greg Laws: Conservation Official, Natal Parks Board

14:30 ***Debate***

14:45 ***Session ends***

9de Sessie

Korrekte aanwending van jaghonde

Paneelbespreking mat SA se top kundiges

Besprekingsleier: John Fair

Paneelede

Willoughby Lord: Farmer & professional hunter, Hofmeyer

Gary Miles: Farmer Queenstown

Flip Potgieter; Boer, Normandien

Johan Strydom: Professionele jagter, Warden

Eldrid Wicks: Professionele jagter, Kokstad

16:30 Forum Eindig"

In a letter dated 17 November 1992[461] to Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: National Problem Animal Committee), Mr. D.J. Matthee (Director: Association of RSCs of the Cape Province) referred to the letter of 19 October 1992 regarding the Final Draft: National Policy and Strategy for Problem Animal Control in South Africa and wrote:

- Due to a time constraint, a working committee could not be convened to study the document. Experts in the service of regional service councils were requested to provide comments and these were summarised as the comments of the association.
- Comments:
- The policy and strategy were put in broad terms and there were uncertainties especially on the role regional service councils can or will play.
- Only at one occasion, there was reference to regional service councils (par 1.3). What did it mean? That the regional service councils were seen as the institutions, which must do the work regarding problem animal control?
- Reference to some "enforcement rules" in legislation is mentioned under section 3.3.1. People are increasingly objecting to this concept and it should preferably be avoided.
- The control of vagrant dog was not adequately addressed and it seemed as if this very big problem was not really considered as a problem. For example, it was said that farmers must be "trained" to accept responsibility for limiting the number of dogs kept on their farms.
- There was no measure of "enforcement measures", especially where such measures were very necessary.

[461] File SDR 3/10 Association of Regional Services Councils of the Cape Province, Port Elizabeth.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

- The regional service councils were not regarded as government institutions, which could in their own right play a role in regions and their roles should be indicated much clearer, especially considering their financial contribution towards problem animal control.

In a fax dated 18 November 1992[462], Mr. Johan Lensing requested that a document attached to the fax urgently be delivered to the meeting of the NPAPC, which was convening in the "Eastern Committee Room." The single page document contained an excerpt: Minute 719/1992 of the Executive Committee Meeting on 17 November 1992. With reference to the submission to the Executive Committee[463] "Approval of the final draft of the National Policy and Strategy for Problem Animal Control in South Africa", namely:

"To resolve:

1.1 paragraph 2.4.3. (d) of the draft policy is not accepted and must be replaced by the following paragraph: - "(d) 'Approved' means a method which was applied in compliance with any act or ordinance or any regulation thereof issued, and the directives and guidelines applicable to any registered remedy or compound being part of it."

1.2 the decision conveyed to the National Problem Animal Policy Committee, and

1.3 the Directorate Management Advisory Services be instructed to, in view of this decision, provide another submission to the Executive Committee regarding the implementation of the function clearing study on problem animal control"[464].

(Nico Vermaak made two handwritten notes on the letter: - This recommendation was accepted by the committee on 18 Nov '92. - Also see the letter by Johan Lensing on WK 40 (d) No. 58, dated 1 February '93. Thereby the Department accepted the policy document.)

On 30 November 1992[465], Mr. G.P. Visagie (Director: Nature and Environmental Conservation) referred to Mr. Nico Vermaak's (Secretary: NPAPC) letter (WK 40 of 21 September 1992) and said the National Policy was approved by the Administrator-in-Executive Committee of the TPA.

Statistics regarding problem animal control in the different regions of the Free State Province were listed in Oranjejag's 1992 Annual Report[466] by the Chairman.

In a letter dated 11 December 1992[467] to the Manager: Eastern Cape Agricultural Union (Queenstown), the Uniondale Farmers Wool and Mohair Growers Association referred to the 'Uniondale Hunt Club and wrote:

[462] File WK 40 (b), NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee, Strategiese Plan.
[463] File ANO 7/138 Chief Directorate of Nature and Environment Conservation.
[464] Minutes of the meeting of the National Problem Animal Policy Committee - Monday 15 November 1990.
[465] File TN 1/11/4/65 Chief Directorate: Nature and Environmental Conservation Division of the Transvaal Provincial Administration, Pretoria.
[466] Oranjejag 1992 Annual Report - Problem Animal Statistics per region in the Orange Free State Province

	Brown hyaena	Caracal		Black-backed jackal		Cape fox		African wildcat		Vagrant dogs	
Region	Getters	Hounds	Cages	Hounds	Getters	Hounds	Getters	Hounds	Cages	Getters	Total
Bloemfontein		46	10	138	101	75	546	35	7	27	985
Smithfield		46	14	85	7	17	113	15	1	2	300
Boshof		19	6	164	166	40	426	21		17	859
Fauresmith				4	22	4	32	2			64
Ventersburg		19	1	249	234	21	353	14	1	60	952
Warden	1	12	60	155	88	52	275	12	4	28	687
Training-hunters					39		4			3	46
Total	1	142	91	795	657	209	1749	99	13	137	3893

[467] File Uniondale Farmers Wool and Mohair Growers' Association, Uniondale.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

- The Uniondale Hunt Club, whose members were also members of organised agriculture, kindly requested the office to engage in discussions with the South African Agricultural Union or enter directly into discussion with the Department Nature Conservation and request the latter as a legal landowner, to meet its financial obligations with the Uniondale Hunt Club.
- The club was founded legally according to ord. 26/1957 and has a constitution as well as audited financial statements.
- According to the ordinance, all landowners were obliged to make a financial contribution. Land was defined as all land on which it was farmed with livestock or all open land larger than one morgen.
- Because the Department did not meet its financial obligations, other landowners (farmers) were using it as justification why they should also not pay the levies.
- On 12 October 1992 the chairpersons of the Uniondale and Oudtshoorn Hunt Clubs, as well as three members of the Klein Karoo RSC, met with Mr. Bekker of the Department Nature Conservation in George. Mr. Bekker was very sympathetic towards their requests and agreed that the Department's properties were definitely potential areas where problem animals could breed and hide. He suggested to engage organised agricultural to ensure the matter could be resolved at the highest level.
- Currently the levy was only a basic fee of R10 per owner plus a further 1c per ha per year, therefore it was considered only a small amount of money was at stake.
- The existence and functioning of the club depended on the financial contribution of landowners. The club was indispensable for the farming community, because without the control of problem animals it was simply impossible to continue with extensive livestock farming
- It was trusted the request would be handled urgently and in earnest.

1993

In a letter dated 4 January 1993[468] to Mr. Kingwill (Port Elizabeth), Dr. L.P. Stoltz (Director: Nature and Environment Conservation, Bloemfontein) wrote:

- He thanked Mr. Kingwill for congratulating him with his appointment. It is a big challenge and the good wishes and support of friends and acquaintances provided the strength for the difficult task.

In January 1993, a 20-page document[469] "*The Strategic Action Plan for executing the National Policy and Strategy for Problem Animal Control in South Africa, as compiled by the National Problem Animal Policy Committee on 18 November 1992*" was processed and ready for distribution.

In a letter dated 15 February 1993[470] to Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC), Mrs. Marcelle Meredith (Executive Director: SPCA National Council of Southern Africa) referred to the Strategic Plan: NPAPC and requested a copy of the document. She added: "*The reason for this request is our concern for livestock and animals in general*."

In a letter dated 18 March 1993[471] to Mr. Johan Lensing (Assistant Director: Nature and Environment Conservation), Mr. D.J. Cook (Deputy Director West, Natal Parks Board) referred

Version 5.0 - H.O. de Waal - Version 5.0

[468] File N8/2/10 Directorate Nature and Environment Conservation, Orange Free State Provincial Administration, Bloemfontein.
[469] File WK 40 (b), NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee, Strategiese Plan.
[470] File WK 40 (b), NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee, Strategiese Plan.
[471] File ANO 9/138, Head Office, Cape Nature Conservation, Cape Provincial Administration, Cape Town.

to the minute, Ref ANO 9/18 of 1 February 1993, and responding to the topic 'Training Courses in Problem Animal Control: Establishment of a uniform standard for hunters and instructors':

"We agreed that the Cape Nature Conservation training manual should be used as the working document for review purposes. Possibly a small specialist sub-committee should be convened for the purpose, in order to ensure that the circumstances in each province are given attention.

They had mixed feelings about the Department of Manpower taking on the role suggested. Once uniform standards and training principles have been agreed upon, it should be fairly easy for the National Woolgrowers to run the courses using specialists recommended by the nature conservation authorities."

In a letter dated 31 March 1993[472] to Mrs. Marcelle Meredith (Executive Director: SPCA National Council of Southern Africa), Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) referred to their telephone conversation as well as the letter dated 15 February 1993:

"*As indicated, the National Policy Document is in its final stage, and is awaiting approval from only a few role players. The forthcoming meeting of this Committee is being held on 6 May 1993, during which this Document will be finalised. Soon after 6 May, you will receive a copy of the document for your cognisance*."

In a letter dated 21 April 1993[473] to Mr. G. Schutte (Manager: RPO, Pretoria), Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA of South Africa) alluded to the '1993/94 Budget: Problem Animal Policy Committee':

- With reference to the discussion with Mr. Nico Vermaak regarding the 1993/94 Budget of the Problem Animal Policy Committee, the proposed budget of the Secretariat was outlined if the NWGA was going to manage the Secretariat in the forthcoming financial year.

Stationary		R 900.00
Telephone, Fax & Postage		R 850.00
Maintenance: Machines		R 120.00
Personnel remuneration	N Vermaak	R 11 000.00
	P Myburgh	R 8 000.00
TOTAL		**R 20 870.00**

- The RPO's contribution would amount to **R10 435.00**. The amount did not include the costs for Travel & Sustenance of the NWGA members.
- If the RPO approved the amount, a cheque for the NWGA of South Africa would be appreciated in the new financial year in July 1993.
- If the RPO should consider assuming responsibility for the Secretariat and operating it at a lower cost, the NWGA would be more than happy to contribute half the costs.
- Any inquiries in this regard would be welcomed.

In a letter dated 31 March 1993[474] to Mr. J.J. Scholtz (Kimberley), Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) referred to 'Inquiry: Territorial Control Methods' and wrote:

- Reference was made to previous letters regarding the topic.
- The inquiry, as well as the letter dated 13 November 1992 to the Secretariat, served on the agenda of the NPAPC.
- After discussion, the NPAPC resolved to refer the problems as stated in the inquiry to Mr. H. Erasmus, Regional Manager: Cape Department of Nature and Environment Conservation. Mr. Erasmus [contact detail in Kimberley] could provide experts at ground level to evaluate the problems and handle with it.

[472] File WK 40 (b), NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee, Strategiese Plan.
[473] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.
[474] File WK 40 (a), NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

- However, the Cape Department of Nature and Environment Conservation emphasised that they could assist with information and advice regarding aspects of problem animal control, but not for problems relating to the Fencing Act because it did not fall under their jurisdiction.
- Regarding problems with the Fencing Act he was referred to Mr. David Kleyn, Deputy Director: Resource Conservation [contact detail in Pretoria].

On 22 April 1993[475] Mr. J.D. van Wyk (Chief Directorate: Nature and Environmental Conservation) referred the Secretary: Eastern Cape Agricultural Union (Queenstown) to 'Uniondale Hunt Club' and wrote:

1. Reference was made to the letter of 29 March 1993 (Ref. L6/12/10/70).

2. Regarding the request of the Uniondale Farmers Wool and Mohair Growers Association that the Chief Directorate must honour its financial obligations towards the Uniondale Hunt Club in respect of membership fees, the Legal Advisor of the Administration commented as follows –

2.1 'According to section 5(3)(a) of the Ordinance on Problem Animal Control, 1957 (Ordinance 26 of 1957), a financial obligation towards a relevant hunt club was based on membership of the said hunt club.

3. Regarding the question if the hunt club may according to section 5(2) of the Ordinance may insist that the Chief Directorate, as an owner of land in the area of the hunt club, be viewed as a member of the hunt club, the Legal Advisor of the Administration commented as follows –

3.1 In section 1 of the Ordinance, 'Land' was defined as 'any land which was primarily used for agricultural purposes or as grazing and all open land of at least 1 morgen'.

3.2 'The land of the Chief Directorate was land used for the purposes of a nature reserve. It is therefore clear that the said land was not 'land' as referred to in the citation.

In a letter dated 3 May 1993[476], Mr. N.A. Ferreira informed Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) that the final draft copy of the National Policy and Strategy for Problem Animal Control in South Africa, with editorial changes as approved by the NPAPC on 18 November 1992, was accepted. (Handwritten note on the signed official letter: received by hand at Golden Gate from N. Ferreira on 6 May 1993.)

In a Press Release, the National Policy and Strategy for Problem Animal Control in South Africa was officially announced on 4 May 1993[477]:

"*Embargo: 10:00 – 4 May 1993*

NATIONAL PROBLEM ANIMAL POLICY COMMITTEE

PRESS RELEASE

A milestone has been reached in the finalisation of a National Policy and Strategy for problem animal control in South Africa by means of a consensus decision as taken by the National Problem Animal Policy Committee.

The Committee is a liaison and co-ordinating forum, combining the powers and knowledge of the Authorities and interested parties in agriculture, to reduce the losses caused by problem animals with the help of acceptable ecological and ethical methods.

The Chairman, Mr. P.E. Kingwill, said that 18 months of contributions, comments, amendments, corrections, etc. by leaders of the National Wool Growers' Association of South Africa, the Red Meat Producers' Organisation, the four provincial Nature Conservation Authorities, the Regional Services Councils and the Hunting Organisations, have culminated in the release of this one document.

[475] File ANR.7/9/5 General Provincial Services Branch, Chief Directorate: Nature and Environmental Conservation, Cape Town (Enquiries: M. van Dyk).
[476] File N10/1/81 Directorate: Nature & Environmental Conservation, Orange Free State Provincial Administration.
[477] File WK 40 (b), NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee, Strategiese Plan.

Version 5.0 - Hoda Wael - Version 5.0

The objectives for problem animal control on policy level and the strategies on how they can be achieved, are contained in the document.

The functions of the Policy Committee are:

- *to promote a national policy for actions by all role players;*
- *to serve as a forum for needs and representations;*
- *to act as the co-ordinating body for the establishment of applicable structures for liaison and communication between interested parties;*
- *to develop specific strategies;*
- *to keep an updated register of approved practitioners; and*
- *to conduct research into problem animals.*

It should be emphasised that the purpose of problem animal control in South Africa is to eliminate the losses of stock cost-effectively, and not the local extermination of species.

This document was available on request from the Secretariat [address].

Issued by: National Problem Animal Policy Committee [address]

Enquiries: N.J. Vermaak (Secretary) *[telephone & fax numbers]*"

The Press Release on 4 May 1993 announcing the "*National Policy and Strategy for Problem Animal Control in South Africa*" coincided strategically with the Problem Animal Control Forum (4-5 May 1993) when it convened at the Golden Gate Highlands National Park in the eastern Orange Free State Province. The forum was well-attended by a number of role players, but as was characteristic of many events during this period in the South African history records of proceedings have been poorly kept, archived or lost since and memories of those present have also been failing. Official recognition and priority was afforded to the initiative and the Problem Animal Control Forum as reflected by input of high-level official provincial representatives, senior staff of the four provincial administrations and several well-known specialists.

Beginning of Proceedings: Problem Animal Control Forum

Excerpts from the presentations made at this watershed event on 4-5 May 1993 are listed below - the excerpts are cited in the sequence that Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) recorded it in the official proceedings[478].

In his opening address, the Chairman of the National Problem Animal Policy Committee, **Mr. Peter (P.E.) Kingwill**[479] described the long process of engaging with role players and stakeholders regarding predation and predation management. With specific reference to the NPAPC, Mr. Kingwill stated, "*The purpose of this committee is to act as a liaison and co-ordinating forum to utilize the abilities and expertise of the authorities and interested parties within agriculture to effectively reduce losses caused by problem animals, using ecologically and ethically acceptable methods.*" Four key areas for advancing strategies were identified, namely: (1) Communication; (2) Control; (3) Training; and (4) Research and Development.

Specific objectives were identified and strategies formulated to address each broad area, culminating in a Strategic Action Plan. It was envisaged that the NPAPC would seek final approval after the Forum has ended, although it was hoped that the Forum could already play a vital role in getting many of the actions off the ground.

[478] Anonymous, 1993. Proceedings of the Problem Animal Control Forum 4th – 5th May 1993. Golden Gate Highlands National Park, Orange Free State Province, South Africa. 90 pp.

[479] Kingwill, Peter, 1993. Opening Address. Proceedings of the Problem Animal Control Forum 4th – 5th May 1993. Golden Gate Highlands National Park, Orange Free State Province, South Africa. pp 1-3.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

According to Mr. Kingwill, the NPAPC reached several conclusions and made the following important comments:

"1 *Much is known and a great deal of experience exists about effectively restricting losses, but the effective communication of this information is very much lacking. This Forum is a major step forward in addressing this problem. You will find suggestions for a number of other ways to solve this problem in the action plan.*

2 Good communication can inform people about what is known, but actual on-the-ground training on how to use the right methods effectively remains essential.

3 To my knowledge, every training course that has been organised has resulted in subsequent success by the trainees. Considering that fact, it is amazing that there is not more enthusiasm amongst farmers to have many more courses."

In conclusion, Mr. Kingwill shared the following with the Forum:

"This Forum, I am sure, will prove invaluable in extending this knowledge-base for farmer, conservationist and animal lover alike, and provide valuable information that can be disseminated as part of the NPAPC communication campaign.

Solutions to conflicting ideas usually lie in better understanding. The average stock farmer is as much an animal lover as any wildlife conservationist. There is a middle road along which the objectives of all parties can be met.

To John Fair, who conceived the idea and brought it to fruition, to Pieter Joubert and everybody else involved in the arrangements of this Forum – congratulations and thank you.

To all the speakers and all those attending – thank you for the time, effort, interest and cost of being here. The turnout has been above expectation, and bodes well for a very successful get-together.

To Nico Vermaak for the excellent job he does as Secretary to the Policy Committee – our grateful thanks.

I hope you all enjoy your short stay at Golden Gate, and that you go home feeling it was well worthwhile. Knowing is the key to success in every sphere."

The presentation by **Mr. Peter Miller**[480], MEC: Natal, was given on his behalf by Mr. D.J. Cook of the Natal Parks Board: "*The Problem Animal Control Ordinance, 1978 (Ordinance 14 of 1978) is a piece of provincial legislation devised to provide assistance to farmers in the control of problem animals in Natal.*" and "*The Ordinance is designed to facilitate the control of problem animals through a system of hunt clubs. I am sure that many of you are familiar with the term 'hunt club', or may even belong to one or to some similar organisation*".

The Problem Animal Control Ordinance provided that the Administrator of the Province may by notice in the Government Gazette "*declare any defined area situated within a problem animal area as a **hunting area**, in which one **hunt club** may be established*" and "*A hunt club may be established upon application being made to the Administrator by **six or more occupiers of land** in a hunting area. **Membership** of a hunt club is **open** to **any owner or occupier** of land within the hunting area*" and then "*A provision of the Ordinance which has proved to be controversial in the past is the provision whereby membership of a hunt club may be declared to be compulsory for all owners and occupiers of land within a declared hunting area. This provision effectively entitles the hunt club to levy subscriptions from members who may be opposed to the very existence of the hunt club. This apparently harsh provision can be justified by the democratic means by which it is implemented."*

[480] Miller, P., 1993. Natal Ordinances. Proceedings of the Problem Animal Control Forum 4th – 5th May 1993. Golden Gate Highlands National Park, Orange Free State Province, South Africa. pp 5-6.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

However, "*before compulsory membership is declared, a meeting of all occupiers of land within a hunting area must be called, and a majority of those present must vote in favour of compulsory membership. The Administrator does however have the power to exempt a person from compulsory membership, upon appeal.*"

It is important to note the following: "*Hunt clubs have a duty to take all necessary legal steps to control problem animals on all land within their hunting area. The Ordinance affords hunt clubs considerable powers with which to fulfil this duty. Hunt clubs have sweeping* ***powers of entry*** *onto lands for the purpose of hunting problem animals. This power is absolute within the hunting area of a hunt club, and is qualified only by, firstly, the need to give notice of the intention to hunt in the vicinity, and for no objection to this to be received in respect of areas outside of the hunting area, and secondly, in respect of the setting of traps or the laying of poison, hunt clubs may not set traps or lay poison in areas* outside of the hunting area.

Hunt clubs were allowed, "*to* ***recover expenses,*** *in respect of their actions taken in order to pursue the control of problem animals in their area, from those occupiers of land who are not members of the club. Where membership of a hunt club is compulsory, the members are* ***protected against criminal or civil action*** *should* ***unintentional*** *damage to persons or property be perpetrated by the member during the course of any act done that is authorised by the Ordinance. As one can therefore see, hunt clubs are powerfully assisted by the Natal Provincial Administration in terms of the law.*"

The NPA assisted hunt clubs financially: each hunt club received a cash subsidy, which amounted to 80% of its annual expenses, subject to a maximum amount of R2 000. The subsidy could be supplemented by a bounty of R40 per problem animal killed; payable to clubs and to individuals, thereby providing additional incentive to the public to destroy problem animals. Only black-backed jackals and caracals were declared as problem animals in Natal and, therefore, qualified for the bounties.

Mr. Miller emphasised that the Ordinance prohibited "*any individual or hunt club from using a poison bait device, such as the 'coyote getter', or from using any other device or poison, without first meeting, inter alia, the following conditions:*
1) A 'certificate of competence' must first be obtained from the Administrator. Effectively, this is a requirement for permission to use poison for the purpose of problem animal control and is intended to safeguard against the accidental poisoning of persons and non-target animals and birds. Although this may appear to constitute 'red tape' in your eyes, unfortunate instances of damage to the environment, especially to bird species, has resulted from farmers who have insufficient knowledge about poisons, using poison unwisely and without permission.
2) The permission of the owner or occupier of land on which the poison or poison bait device is to be used must be obtained, and prior notice must be given to the occupiers of all land adjoining the land upon which the poison or poison bait device is to be used.
3) Warning notices must be erected at all of the entrances to the land upon which the poison or poison bait device is to be used."

Mr. Miller continued: "*Generally, the use of poisons in problem animal control is becoming increasingly important, and further regulations in this regard, in order to prevent the possible misuse of poison, can be expected in the near future. This should not cause farmers undue concern, however, as the aims of problem animal control and of protection of the environment are not mutually exclusive, and both aims can be met with the necessary co-operation between farmers and the authorities.*"

Version 5.0, HO de Waal - Version 5.0

The Ordinance gave the Administrator the power to appoint an Advisory Committee on Problem Animal Control "*to advise him, the hunt clubs, farmers and other interested persons in regard to problem animal control and to institute, conduct, co-ordinate and control research into the scientific and technical aspects and habits of problem animals or animals likely to be declared problem animals, in order to determine the most efficient methods of problem animal control. As you may know, such a committee has been functioning in Natal for some time.*"

Unlike the other three provinces, the Proceedings of the Forum provided no clear indication if the Natal Province also officially subscribed to the new formulated National Policy and Strategy for Problem Animal Control in South Africa. However, the official high-level attendance and presentation at the Forum suggested that the Natal Province was also in agreement with the principle.

Mr. Pieter (P.J.S.) Olivier[481], a MEC: PAO said that, since 1 January 1966, Oranjejag was the only predator control association in the Province and subsidised by the Administration to perform predator control. Regulations of the Ordinance for Nature Conservation (Ordinance No. 8 of 1969) restricted the undue use of control methods to protect non-target animals, including birds, people and the environment. Oranjejag was a statuary body and managed its affairs in accordance with a constitution; its responsibility was to control damage-causing animals and for the 1993/94 financial year received a subsidy of R679 000. In 1993, Oranjejag employed 16 white and 10 black hunters, but with limited financial resources (membership subscriptions and the Administration's subsidy) battled to stem the increasing tide of predation in the Province, especially from black-backed jackals and caracals.

Because of recurring financial miseries, the disbanding of Oranjejag became imminent; the Provincial Administration acted on information and recommendations, which had been provided in 1988[482]. Underlying causes for the predicament of Oranjejag and possible solutions were stated: "*Public resistance against Oranjejag's monopoly with its rising membership fees, penalties for non-members and an inadequate service, made it necessary to introduce a new strategy. In the past, landowners themselves helped to hunt predators, but with the establishment of Oranjejag, this expertise disappeared during the course of time. New hunters will now have to be trained to master the art of hunting once again. The results of Oranjejag have also been interpreted incorrectly. The numbers of problem animal species killed annually were published. However, no mention was made of the number of complaints from members of Oranjejag which were stopped temporarily. Thus the cost-effectivity of control was not determined.*"

Mr. Olivier concluded, "*What will we do now? As already mentioned, negotiations are already being conducted with Oranjejag, farmers' associations and the Director of Nature Conservation to determine a new problem animal strategy. In the meantime the hunters of Oranjejag are continuing with their control programme.*"

The Orange Free State Province indicated its support for the National Policy and Strategy for Problem Animal Control in South Africa (dated 18 November 1992) and stated that future development of predation management will be aligned accordingly. Unlike the previous predation control programme conducted under the auspices of Oranjejag, the envisaged

[481] Olivier, P.J.S., 1993. Vrystaatse ordonnansies wat betrekking het op probleemdiere. Proceedings of the Problem Animal Control Forum 4th – 5th May 1993. Golden Gate Highlands National Park, Orange Free State Province, South Africa. pp 7-10.
[482] Ferreira, N.A., 1988. Sekere aspekte van die ekologie en die beheer van die rooikat (*Felis caracal*) in die Oranje-Vrystaat. Project N7/7/5, dated May 1988.

Version 5.0 – Do do Wash Version 5.0

problem animal control programme in the Orange Free State Province would not be centralised anymore and the strategy will be based on accepted economical, ecological and sociological principles for effective control of problem animals.

In conclusion, Mr. Olivier stressed that meaningful funding of predator control organisations will remain important obstacles, which must be addressed.

Mr. Johan (J.E.) Lensing[483] of the Cape Provincial Department of Nature Conservation and Museums stated that his institution was supporting of the principles of the National Policy and Strategy for Problem Animal Control in South Africa.

Mr. Lensing said a government should first determine policies and then adjust or align legislation. Problem animal control in the Cape Province was in a transitional phase where policy had changed but legislation was not yet been adapted accordingly. The Department of Nature Conservation and Museums developed its policy over time, based on the following assumptions:

> *"Conflict with problem animals is an inherent risk of farming within or adjacent to an area where a continuous natural habit exists and is therefore an industry related problem of producers in agriculture*.
>
> *The reduction or elimination of losses caused by problem animals is part of the producer's production process, the primary responsibility for which rests with the landowner or user."*

The Department's goal with problem animal control was "*to provide support services to the farming community to reduce losses and damage while preventing harming of the nature and environment.*" The core functions of the Department were summarised as:

- Regulating problem animal control in accordance with legislation to achieve conservation goals.
- Conduct scientific research on problem animals and the ecological systems in which they operate, aimed at managing these systems to achieve conservation goals.
- Provide equipment and support to farmers and problem animal hunters where it is in the interest of conservation or the public or where the private sector does not have the ability to provide this service.
- Provide training and extension regarding problem animal control to promote the use of cost-efficient, ecological and ethical acceptable control practices in support of conservation goals. This was a communication function.

Although the Vermin Extermination Ordinance, 1957 (Ordinance 26 of 1957) was amended by the Problem Animal Control Amendment Ordinance, 1984 (Ordinance 19 of 1984), it was still outdated. Introduction of a new Ordinance was delayed in anticipation of the completion of the National Policy and Strategy for Problem Animal Control in South Africa. Mr. Lensing listed a few items to show how outdated and non-applicable the existing ordinance was. Arrangements were underway to develop a new draft ordinance and ensure participation by role players and interest groups before it was published.

Mr. Lensing concluded by saying that since 1987, the Cape Department of Nature Conservation and Museums made good progress with implementing its current policy:

[483] Lensing, J.E., 1993. Beleid en wetgewing oor probleemdierbeheer in die Kaapprovinsie. Proceedings of the Problem Animal Control Forum 4th – 5th May 1993. Golden Gate Highlands National Park, Orange Free State Province, South Africa. pp 11-15.

Version 5.0 - HG de Waal - Version 5.0

- The Section Problem Animal Control existed as a separate entity and in 1987 it was disbanded and the functions decentralised at the different regional offices; problem animal control functions were thus not provided from a central point any more.
- The sale of bait to farmers and problem animal hunters was stopped in 1987; the private sector took over the service and the Department was only providing information regarding bait recipes.
- The two hound breeding stations at Vrolijkheid and Adelaide were closed in 1989 and the sale of hounds phased out; all aspects of problem animal hunting hounds in the Cape Province have been taken over by the private sector.
- In 1988 it was decided to stop the subsidies for the problem animal hunt clubs of Divisional Councils and phase it out gradually over a five year period, namely: 1990/91 (-0% - R43 000), 1991/92 (-25% - R32 250), 1992/93 (-50% - R21 500), 1993/94 (-75% - R10 750) and 1994/95 (-100%).
- The cost of training courses for problem animal control was brought on par with those in the private sector. It reduced competition and served as incentive for the private sector to increase their involvement in training.
- The Department continued its research and extension on problem animals and conservation of species and ecological systems.

According to Mr. Lensing, a considerable shift in policy was achieved during the past 10 years, but the Department still saw a role for itself in the province. Because of the cooperation established with the NPAPC and the formulation of proposals for new legislation regarding problem animal control in the Cape Province, it was foreseen that a more fair and balanced dispensation will be developed for this important function.

Mr. Vis (G.P.) Visagie[484] of the Chief Directorate Nature and Environment Conservation in the Transvaal Province, summarised important aspects regarding the Nature Conservation Ordinance, 1983 (Ordinance 12 of 1983), as amended and the nature conservation regulations which were promulgated in accordance with the provisions. Chapter V of the Ordinance was discussed according to its subheadings: application of the chapter; problem animals; hunt clubs; hunting by clubs; hunting of problem animals by employees of the Administration; research on problem animals; hounds; financial aid to clubs; and misconducts. Mr. Visagie stressed that over and above the activities of hunt clubs and employees, problem animals may be hunted, captured and destroyed by individual farmers.

Mr. Visagie briefly summarised the specific regulations: a recent change was the lawful use of strychnine in poison but in pills not being larger than 75 g, and strychnine could only be legally obtained with a prescription from a veterinarian.

In conclusion, Mr. Visagie said the current provisions of the Ordinance were too prescriptive and the control of problem animals was overregulated. During revisions, many aspects will be considered; hunt clubs have for example became almost obsolete and may well vanish from the scene. Any envisaged changes to the Ordinance will be done in cooperation with organised agriculture and in accordance with the National Policy and Strategy for Problem Animal Control in South Africa.

[484] Visagie, G.P., 1993. Probleemdierwetgewing in Transvaal. Proceedings of the Problem Animal Control Forum 4th – 5th May 1993. Golden Gate Highlands National Park, Orange Free State Province, South Africa. pp 16-18.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

Mr. Petrus (P.J.J.) van Rensburg[485] also of the Chief Directorate Nature and Environment Conservation in the Transvaal Province elaborated on the definitions, which were widely used in ecological context. Ecology is the "*study of the mutual relations and interactions between living organisms (plants and animals - biotic) and the non-living components (chemical substances, physical conditions, energy, etc. - abiotic) in their environment.*" Therefore, ecology, which is a study, cannot be disturbed but process can be disturbed with ensuing unforeseen consequences. In the context of the definition for ecology, Mr. van Rensburg dealt in detail with important aspects of nutrition ecology, population ecology, social ecology and lastly prey-predator ratios.

Mr. van Rensburg concluded: "*The control of damage must be economically justified in terms of the losses experienced. Damage control operations are time consuming and expensive and often have a greater financial impact than the losses incurred. Intensive research in this field, both locally and in the USA, has not yet produced a single instant solution. With the introduction of every new damage control method, the predator developed an evading reaction because of their phenomenal adaptability. The research also showed that eradication efforts were futile; therefore, problem animal control must be aimed as far as possible at the damage causing individual.*"

The core message was that farmers must develop a good understanding of the different interactions at play in the ecological system on their farms. In the event that a damage control method is not effective, the farmer must be able to adjust and improve the practical application of the method or include alternative methods to mitigate the impact of predation.

Mr. R.W. Markham[486], a nature conservationist of the Natal Parks Board, provided background on the reasons why some animals become problem animals with specific reference to the biology of the black-backed jackal, caracal and domestic dogs, being the major predators of sheep in the RSA. White-tailed mongooses and Cape foxes, usually predating on very small, also caused young lambs some problems. He related the food habits of the three larger predators to the specific mode in which they prey on small livestock. This information is very important to identify the specific predator and in choosing the more appropriate method or methods to manage the predator and mitigate losses.

Mr. Johan Loubser[487], a sheep farmer from Mariental in Namibia, alluded to his personal experience with predation losses since November 1986. Initially he was ignorant regarding predation and his neighbours denied experiencing any problems with predators. Very soon, he was confronted with an untenable situation and had to rely on foothold traps, coyote getters, cage traps, hunting hounds and the services of a professional hunter.

Over a period of three years, 6 to 14 black-backed jackals were killed monthly and 2 to 7 caracal caught in cage traps. Cheetahs killed his entire flock of Karakul rams on 26 and 27 December 1988 and he seriously contemplated to abandon small livestock farming and move elsewhere to engage in irrigation farming. Namibia's Nature Conservation was aware of his

Version 5.0 - HD de Waal - Version 5.0

[485] Van Rensburg, P.J.J., 1993. Basiese ekologie en roofdier/prooiverhoudings op boerderygrond. Proceedings of the Problem Animal Control Forum 4th – 5th May 1993. Golden Gate Highlands National Park, Orange Free State Province, South Africa. pp 19-31.

[486] Markham, R.W., 1993. Comparative biology of sheep predators. Proceedings of the Problem Animal Control Forum 4th – 5th May 1993. Golden Gate Highlands National Park, Orange Free State Province, South Africa. pp 32-33.

[487] Loubser, J., 1993. Namibiese ondervinding met die veebeskermingshalsband. Proceedings of the Problem Animal Control Forum 4th – 5th May 1993. Golden Gate Highlands National Park, Orange Free State Province, South Africa. pp 34-36.

challenges regarding predation and Mr. Steve Gildenhuys, a researcher visited the farm and introduced the concept of the livestock protection collar (LPC).

According to an APHIS factsheet[488] *"The LPC consists of two small rubber bladders containing 15 ml each of Compound 1080 (sodium fluoroacetate), placed under the throat of a sheep or goat, and held in place with Velcro™ straps. When a coyote attacks a collared animal and bites the throat where the LPC is positioned, the coyote receives a dose of Compound 1080 in the mouth. Sodium fluoroacetate is a naturally occurring organic fluorine compound extracted from the West African plant "ratbane" (Dichapetalum toxicarium). WS currently uses less than 4 tablespoons of the compound nationwide each year. It works by blocking the Krebs cycle, the major mechanism for releasing energy from food. Within 5 hours of receiving a dose in the mouth, the coyote will die a painless death from cardiac failure or central nervous system failure."*

With the assistance of Mr. Gildenhuys, two caracals that created problems were eliminated with LPC's and for a long period, there were not any predation losses. Eventually he also became personally acquainted with Mr. Roy McBride from Texas, the developer of the LPC. Mr. Loubser elaborated on his personal experience and provided information regarding the appropriate method to select young target, or bait, animals in a flock and fit them with LPC's. He emphasised the precautionary measures such as the use of appropriate safety gloves and that wool/hair of target animals contaminated with poison (pink colour), as well as carcasses of target animals and predators, must be burnt.

On 31 December 1980 Compound 1080 (sodium fluoroacetate) was banned from being used in LPC's in South Africa and substituted with the so-called PDB 1 (Carbofurane), a concentrated organophosphate.

Mr. Loubser stated that the LPC was a very target specific method to control predators. However, he lamented that Compound 1080 was banned from being used in LPC's and cited scientific evidence that sodium fluoroacetate was far less detrimental to the environment, ecology and non-target animals than PDB 1.

Mr. Hansie Spies[489], a wool sheep farmer from Harrismith in the eastern Orange Free State Province, shared his experience with the LPC's containing PDB 1; if applied correct and with diligence the LPC is an effective method to control (exterminate) black-backed jackals. The way in which LPC's must be handled and the necessary safety precautions were described in detail. According to Mr. Spies, a farmer needs only 5 to 10 LPC's to remove black-backed jackals that have been spoiled and became habitual predators of livestock. Mr. Spies concluded by saying he was aware of efforts by Nature Conservation to reinstate the use of a less toxic, but effective poison (a reference to sodium fluoroacetate).

Mr. Niël (N.A.) Ferreira[490], a Nature Conservation Scientist of the Directorate Nature and Environment Conservation, Orange Free State Province, elaborated on a specific disadvantage of the LPC's, as it is currently used in South Africa. As discussed previously, the LPC was designed during the early 1970s by Mr. Roy McBride in Texas, USA. The poison sodium fluoroacetate, commonly known as Compound 1080, was used in the sachets of the

[488] APHIS Wildlife Services Factsheet September 2002. The livestock protection collar. Animal and Plant Health Inspection service, United States Department of Agriculture.
[489] Spies, Hansie, 1993. Ek boer saam met jakkals. Proceedings of the Problem Animal Control Forum 4th – 5th May 1993. Golden Gate Highlands National Park, Orange Free State Province, South Africa. pp 37.
[490] Ferreira, N.A., 1993. Probleme met die verkeerde gif. Proceedings of the Problem Animal Control Forum 4th – 5th May 1993. Golden Gate Highlands National Park, Orange Free State Province, South Africa. pp 38-40.

Version 5.0 - Hinde Waal - Version 5.0

LPC's. During the 1960s and 1970s, public resistance grew against the contamination of the environment because of the large-scale use of poisons such as DDT and BHC; the use of sodium fluoroacetate was also stopped, because it was lethal for people and animals. Sodium fluoroacetate was prohibited since 31 December 1981 from being used in South Africa in terms of section 29(1) of the Act on Hazardous Substances (Act 15 of 1973).

Since the banning of Compound 1080 (sodium fluoroacetate) in LPC's in South Africa, it was substituted with the so-called PDB 1, a concentrated organophosphate. However, the toxicity of the new poison was never tested to determine whether it kills scarce and endangered animal species that may scavenge carcasses or lick on leaking PCL's. Case studies have indeed shown unintentional collateral deaths in vultures and birds of prey such as eagles because of the use of LPC's.

In the Orange Free State Province, the Directorate of Nature and Environment Conservation issued permits to sheep farmers to use LPC's; the permit contains directives how the LPC's must be used appropriately. If vultures and birds of prey such as eagles were present in an area, farmers should use alternative predator control methods.

Mr. Ferreira concluded by referring to high-level negotiations to authorise again the inclusion of Compound 1080 (sodium fluoroacetate) in the LPC's.

Mr. Maurice Williamson[491], Director of the private firm Gallagher Power Fence, discussed in detail the concept of this management tool and alluded to the correct use of electric power in wildlife control programmes. With a view to consider whether such technology should be used, information was presented as answers to the following four questions:

- What is a Power Fence?
- How does Power Fence work?
- What are the advantages of Power Fence?
- Is it effective?

Mr. Williamson alluded to the so-called "ten golden rules" when using power fencing and to enjoy its full advantages, namely:

1. Understand and apply the basic principles of power fencing.
2. Pay particular attention to earthing.
3. Use high-powered energisers.
4. Plan your layout with the future in mind.
5. Use cut out switches.
6. Galvanised to galvanise to prevent electrolysis.
7. Use the best quality materials available and do not take short cuts.
8. Use the correct fence design.
9. Practice fence hygiene.
10. Fire up your fence line as construction proceeds.

Mr. Williamson concluded by saying "*while it is impossible in the time available to discuss all aspects of Power Fencing, adherence to these ten golden rules will go a long way to ensuring one enjoys the benefits of this management tool, which, throughout Africa, and indeed the world, is proving to be a highly economical and effective means of controlling problem animals.*"

[491] Williamson, M., 1993. Critical factors which influence the success rate achieved using power fencing as a means of problem animal control. Proceedings of the Problem Animal Control Forum 4th – 5th May 1993. Golden Gate Highlands National Park, Orange Free State Province, South Africa. pp 41-49.

Version 5.0 HO de Wael - Version 5.0

Mr. Duncan (H.W.) Heard[492], a Nature Conservator of Cape Nature Conservation and Museums, also alluded to the use of power or electric fencing as an effective management tool to keep problem animals out. Mr. Heard started by stating, "*Problem animal control methods used in South Africa are mostly reactive. They concentrate on controlling problem animal populations after damage has been done. This Forum's programme illustrates this very point in that most of it is dedicated to the treatment of the problem rather than the prevention. More emphasis should be placed on methods that prevent crop damage or stock losses.*"

The role of preventative measures in combating wildlife damage was explained with reference to the National Policy and Strategy for Problem Animal Control in South Africa; participants in the NPAPC developed this initiative, committed themselves to the code of conduct, and undertook to promote its provisions, namely:

"*2.4.1 Problem animal control will be based on a threefold approach:*

(a) The repulsion or destruction of individual animals causing losses.

(b) The reduction of problem animal populations where it is reasonable to assume that this will prevent losses.

(c) *The adaption of farm management practices to avoid losses.*"

Therefore, "*preventative measures which repel problem animals and avoid damage are thus strongly supported by this Committee.*"

Furthermore, Cape Nature Conservation and Museums *"attempts, through its problem animal extension programme, to change the general approach of landowners/farmers to wildlife damage. The objective of this strategy is the reduction of damage by ecologically acceptable and cost-effective means.*" This approach was based on a five-point strategy:

1. Understanding the basic causes for wildlife depredation.
2. Attitude when trying to solve problems.
3. Evaluation of the problem.
4. Protection against damage.
5. Effective and selective control of problem animals.

Preventing damage through protection formed an important part of the five-point strategy; therefore, "*Conventional fences in its many forms, has been shown to form effective barriers for just about any animal, the only limiting factor being that of cost. In other words, the more wire specified, the more costly the fence, and furthermore, contrary to what some people believe, these fences must be correctly designed, erected and maintained in order to be effective against target species. They cannot merely be erected and left.*" However, the rising cost of conventional fencing was making it uneconomical for many applications.

Highlighting from his research with power fencing, Mr. Heard listed three important aspects:

- Power Fencing as an effective preventative control method.
- Acceptance of Power Fencing as a problem animal control (PAC) method.
- Recommendations to promote power Fencing as a wildlife damage control method.

Mr. Heard concluded that pro-active damage prevention methods needed to be promoted more actively. More research and extension were needed, as well as standardisation of fencing accessories and extending after-sales services. Nature conservation authorities could

[492] Heard, H.W., 1993. Keeping problem animals out with power (electric) fencing. Proceedings of the Problem Animal Control Forum 4th – 5th May 1993. Golden Gate Highlands National Park, Orange Free State Province, South Africa. pp 50-52.

Version 5.0 - No download - Version 5.0

also support preventative control methods by issuing conditional hunting permits in respect of wildlife damage.

Mr. Martinus Postma[493] of the High Veld Agricultural Development Institute near Potchefstroom, Transvaal Province described how the valuable research results have been lost when black-backed jackals predated lambs at the Experimental Farm. Reducing the population density of black-backed jackals in the area was not successful in reducing predation. Other methods to mitigate losses were also ineffective. Therefore, a method had to be found to protect 400 ewes and their lambs for a period of 6 weeks during the annual lambing season. An adapted electrified fence system was erected to enclose 50 ha veld and make it jackal proof; the total length of the system was 4.5 km. The staff designed and constructed the system, which was erected adjacent to the existing perimeter fence. Detailed plans of the equipment were provided. Tracks of black-backed jackals were detected outside the perimeter. Over a 3-year period, only 3 lambs were lost to predation and it happened when the power supply to the system was unexpectedly disrupted.

Mr. Dave Simpson[494] a farmer from Kokstad in East Griqualand, Natal Province described how different methods were used unsuccessfully to reduce predation losses; kraaling ewes and lambs at night (causing even more lamb losses), tying dogs close to the sheep, sleeping with guns in the veld and resorting to hanging storm lanterns out. Eventually they followed the example of a neighbour and enclosed the farm Cooperdale by encircling it with 6 km electric fence; provided by Gallagher Power Fencing Systems. Lamb losses dropped from about 120 per year to a single lamb in the year after installing the electric system: "*The cost of installing the electric fence was more than made up by the cost of the lambs saved during the first season*."

Mr. André Kok[495], a farmer from Marquard, Orange Free State Province said survival in the small livestock industry requires good footwork because of poor profit margins and unsympathetic government policy. He listed the predation losses ascribed to black-backed jackals, caracals and Cape foxes; showing the decline in predation losses since investing in good electric fences. The cost of fencing was less than R750/km with a standard 5-strand electric fence; enclosing a 20 ha camp for lambing and keep predators out would cost R270/year or the equivalent of three lambs when discounted over 5 years.

Mr. Pieter Joubert[496], Wolex[497] Extension Officer, Harrismith, eastern Orange Free State Province commended the value of training farmers and workers to control predators. He alluded to the excellent training course presented by Mr. Peter Schneekluth of Prins Albert in the Karoo. The hunter school was conducted over 5 days on the farm Kendal at the foothills of the Drakensberg. The success stories of several farmers were listed. The simple message received from farmers that participated in the training course to others experiencing damage caused by predators was:

- Tackle the problem yourself.

[493] Postma, M., Aucamp, L.J.S. & Le Roux, P.C., 1993. Beskerming van skape op die HLOI se proefplaas te Potchefstroom. Proceedings of the Problem Animal Control Forum 4th – 5th May 1993. Golden Gate Highlands National Park, Orange Free State Province, South Africa. pp 53-57.
[494] Simpson, Dave, 1993. How we reduced lamb losses to jackal. Proceedings of the Problem Animal Control Forum 4th – 5th May 1993. Golden Gate Highlands National Park, Orange Free State Province, South Africa. pp 58.
[495] Kok, André, 1993. Elektriese heining keer die Vrystaatse jakkals. Proceedings of the Problem Animal Control Forum 4th – 5th May 1993. Golden Gate Highlands National Park, Orange Free State Province, South Africa. pp 59-60.
[496] Joubert, Pieter, 1993. Jagterskool werk! Proceedings of the Problem Animal Control Forum 4th – 5th May 1993. Golden Gate Highlands National Park, Orange Free State Province, South Africa. pp 61.
[497] File WK 40 (b), NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee, Strategiese Plan [Wolex Cooperative Ltd, Harrismith].

Version 5.0 - HOCR Wad - Version 5.0

- Let your worker be trained.
- Provide the worker with the correct equipment.
- Encourage the worker.

In conclusion, Mr. Joubert stated, "*If you and your neighbours follow this advice you will be surprised by the results.*"

Mr. Dirk (D.J.) Brand[498] a Conservationist of the Cape Department of Nature Conservation and Museums in Kimberley, Cape Province was in the process of completing a doctoral study on the back-backed jackal[499]. Three key questions were investigated in the study:

- "*What are the most important factors which influence the efficiency, selectivity and cost of using coyote getters to control the black-backed jackal?*
- *How do these factors influence the unsatisfactory performance of coyote getters?*
- *Why do behavioural factors influence the unsatisfactory performance of coyote getters?"*

Mr. Brand used scientific results from his study and showed how easy it was to change quite unintentionally the behaviour of black-backed jackals. Recommendations for the *"control of black-backed jackal using coyote getters are as follows:*

1. Improve the hunter's ability to kill black-backed jackal by training, developing skills, and improving motivation;
2. Select trap-sites where the possibility of killing non-target animals is lower;
3. Base the feasibility of control operations on predicted efficiency of coyote getters, determined by rainfall and local management effort;
4. Avoid lengthy control operations which promote avoidance behaviour;
5. Alternate the use of coyote getters and other methods (i.e. denning, toxic collars) in the short and long term to delay avoidance learning; and
6. Alternate baits to delay avoidance learning."

Mr. Johan (J.C.) Strydom[500], a professional specialist predator hunter from Warden in the eastern Orange Free State Province, shared his personal experience in predation management. He was employed by Oranjejag and based at Boshof in the western Orange Free State Province. He was later transferred to Warden and eventually resigned from Oranjejag to become a private specialist predator hunter. He alluded to frustrations with hound packs not being able to catch caracals easily and started looking for alternative control methods. Acting on an article in the Landbouweekblad by the Cape Department of Nature Conservation, he designed and constructed four cage traps for caracals. Different baits were evaluated with varying, but poor, success until he started using sand drenched with caracal urine. The success rate to catch caracal improved markedly.

The cage traps were designed to catch caracals but were also suitable to catch most other animals such as baboons, different mongoose species, African wildcats, civets, aardwolves and vagrant dogs. The big advantage of a cage trap is its selectivity and that non-target animals can be released alive. Mr. Strydom shared valuable personal experience on the design of different types of cage traps for caracals, information on the placement and

[498] Brand, D.J., 1993. The humane coyote getter: an analytical viewpoint. Proceedings of the Problem Animal Control Forum 4th – 5th May 1993. Golden Gate Highlands National Park, Orange Free State Province, South Africa. pp 62-79.
[499] Brand, D.J., 1993. The influence of behaviour on the management of black-backed jackal. Ph.D. thesis. Faculty of Agricultural Sciences, University of Stellenbosch.
[500] Strydom, Johan, 1993. Vanghok vir rooikat – my ervaring. Proceedings of the Problem Animal Control Forum 4th – 5th May 1993. Golden Gate Highlands National Park, Orange Free State Province, South Africa. pp 80-83.

Version 5.0. HO de Waal - Version 5.0

concealing of cage traps, and the use of different baits. He emphasised the need for good training of operators to achieve best results in catching damage-causing caracals.

Mr. Greg Laws[501] of the Natal Parks Boards, Estcourt (Natal Province), started by stating: "*The National Problem Animal Policy Committee accepts that the control of problem animals is the responsibility of farmers. Farmers are in business, and if control is their responsibility, then their primary concern is profitability. It is essential that they are able to reduce or remove the cause of losses, which affect their livelihood using tools that make business sense in terms of cost, and are within their capacity to implement. These tools are opportunities to farmers, opportunities to solve business problems.*"

Although farmers have a range of control methods available, many resort to the indiscriminate use of poisons. However, "*when a farmer uses poison he invariably does so illegally*." This happened despite the information distributed widely by the Natal Parks Board advising farmers to refrain from such illegal practices as "*gif gooi*" (throwing poison), the illegal use of this tool continued.

Mr. Laws described how a specific tool, namely "*single lethal dose (SLD) poison drop bait"* (filled with Compound 1080 – sodium monofluoroacetate) potentially may provide an effective and selective solution to mitigate the effects of predation at a relatively low cost. A list of advantages was provided for SLD (containing Compound 1080) over other methods of problem animal control. A disadvantage of Compound 1080 was the long time it required to kill the target predator, thus allowing the animal to travel quite a distance before dying and the carcass often not being found.

Mr. Willoughby Lord[502], a professional hunter from Hofmeyr in the Cape Province, provided some historical perspective of predation on the farm of his grandparents where he grew up and cited stock losses from an old stock book during 1915, ascribed to black-backed jackals and caracals. He described his experience in hunting predators with packs of hounds and suggested the ideal composition of the 25 hounds in the pack; including the necessary resting of some hounds from hunting, young hounds in training as well as young pups not yet in training.

End of Proceedings: Problem Animal Control Forum

In the Golden Fleece ("Goue Vag") of May 1993[503], the headline of a news item "A milestone for problem animal control" announced that the National Policy and Strategy for Problem Animal Control in South Africa was finalised. The text was a copy of the Press Release of 4 May 1993. Readers could request copies of the document from the NWGA in Port Elizabeth.

In a letter dated 4 May 1993[504], P.J. Badenhorst (Petrusburg) requested the NWGA for information on the document on problem animal control, which was mentioned on p 9 of the "Goue Vag." (Handwritten note on the letter: sent 14 May 1993).

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

[501] Laws, G.D., 1993. Single lethal dose drop baits as an ecologically acceptable and cost-effective means of controlling predators of small stock. Proceedings of the Problem Animal Control Forum 4th – 5th May 1993. Golden Gate Highlands National Park, Orange Free State Province, South Africa. pp 84-88.
[502] Lord, Willoughby, 1993. Correct use of pack hounds. Proceedings of the Problem Animal Control Forum 4th – 5th May 1993. Golden Gate Highlands National Park, Orange Free State Province, South Africa. pp 89-90.
[503] File WK 40 (b), NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee, Strategiese Plan.
[504] File WK 40 (b), NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee, Strategiese Plan.

In a letter dated 4 May 1993[505], D.F. Handby (Marindale) requested the NWGA for a copy of the document on problem animal control, which was advertised in the Golden Fleece. (Handwritten note on the letter: sent 14 May 1993).

In a letter dated 5 May 1993[506], A.C. Meyer (Dullstroom) requested the NWGA for a copy of the document on problem animals, which was mentioned in the "Goue Vag." (Handwritten note on the letter: sent 14 May 1993).

Pursuant to a decision taken by the NPAPC on 6 May 1993, copies of the National Policy and Strategy for Problem Animal Control in South Africa and the Press Release (dated 4 May 1993) were posted to several interested parties.

In a letter dated 24 May 1993[507], Mr. V.L. Pringle (Bedford) requested the Secretariat of the Problem Animal Policy Committee for a copy of the National Policy and Strategy for Problem Animal Control in South Africa. Mr. Pringle said he was hunting with his pack of hounds in the area of the Baviaans River. (Handwritten note on the letter: sent 2 June 1993).

In a letter dated 24 May 1993[508] to Mr. J.E. Lensing (Chief Directorate, Cape Nature Conservation, Cape Town), Mr. P.J.J. van Rensburg (Chief Directorate: Nature and Environmental Conservation, TPA, Pretoria) referred to 'Training courses in problem animal control: establishing uniform standards for hunters and instructors' (Ref. ANO 9/18 dated 1 February 1993) and wrote:

- Regarding the letter referred to previously, it was their view that the Cape Province Problem Animal Manual was only drafted for conditions in the province and fell short on several aspects to serve as a manual at national level. Chapters 2 & 3 dealt only with the Cape policy and legislation. Some species responsible for damage in the Transvaal were not mentioned and the use of poison was not dealt with at all. Little emphasis was placed on preventative measures and background on behaviour and ecological aspects of species[509] were not given.
- Therefore, it was difficult to make recommendations on such a course to be used as a uniform manual at national level. The curriculum for agricultural colleges, which was compiled by the Interprovincial Problem Animal Committee, should rather be used as guideline. The problem animal manuals of the respective provinces could be incorporated in the curriculum to provide a uniform manual. (The proposed curriculum for colleges of agriculture was attached).
- The problem animal situation differed between regions, requiring different approaches to solve problems, and these differences should be incorporated in the manual. It would make the manual a comprehensive document, which would again be a task for the Interprovincial Problem Animal Committee.

CURRICULUM (proposal attached by Mr. P.J.J. van Rensburg – 24 May 1993)

1. Introduction

Theoretical lectures dealing with:

1.1 Definition of concepts

Problem animal, selectivity, control method, efficacy, control device, trap days, control success, macro setting site, target animal, micro setting site and non-target animal.

[505] File WK 40 (b), NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee, Strategiese Plan.
[506] File WK 40 (b), NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee, Strategiese Plan.
[507] File WK 40 (b), NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee, Strategiese Plan.
[508] File TN 1/11/4/65 Chief Directorate: Nature and Environmental Conservation, Transvaal Provincial Administration, Pretoria.
[509] Editor's Note: see Van Rensburg, P.J.J., 1993. Basiese ekologie en roofdier/prooiverhoudings op boerderygrond. Proceedings of the Problem Animal Control Forum 4th – 5th May 1993. Golden Gate Highlands National Park, Orange Free State Province, South Africa. pp 19-31.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

1.2 Origin of problem animals

Ecological changes because of agriculture and other developments, which bring animals and people in conflict.

1.3 History of problem animal control

1.3.1 Developing approaches and perceptions (vermin-problem animal-damage control, extermination vs control).

1.3.2 The role of Nature Conservation organisations.

1.3.3 Development of control methods.

1.3.4 Development of problem animal management.

1.3.5 Development of control organisations.

1.3.6 Myths regarding problem animals.

2. Legislation and Policy

Each college present the relevant Provincial Ordinance and Policy (function of Province vs landowner), as well as other related acts (Fencing Act, Dangerous Substances, national plaques, etc.).

3. Ecology

Description of the ecology of problem animals and other animal species, which cause problems in the relevant region.

3.1 Population dynamics

Emphasis on among other the following aspects:

3.1.1 Natural fluctuations in population numbers (annual and seasonal).

3.1.2 Predator-prey relations.

3.1.3 Factors influencing population density.

Availability of resources, age structure, competitions: inter and intraspecific, dispersion, reproductive strategies, social organisation and behaviour, sex ratio, artificial manipulation of populations.

3.2 Life history of relevant species (harmful and not harmful).

4. Damage control measures

4.1 Selectivity and Efficacy

4.1.1 The aim with damage control (mitigating damage) is presented.

4.1.2 The preferred order of control measures.

The interdependency of non-lethal methods, lethal methods aimed at damage-causing individuals and lethal methods aimed damage-causing species is highlighted in terms of selectivity and efficacy.

4.1.3 The requirement of cost-effectiveness.

4.1.4 The effect of unselective control.

4.2 Identification of damage

Determining which predator caused damage by among other the following criteria: tracks, method of killing, teeth width, feeding method, movement of prey, size of prey.

4.3 Choice of control method

4.3.1 Overview of different devices available

4.3.2 Conditions for using each device

Target specie, habitat, history of problem, setting sites available, disposing of captured animals, status of specie, number that must be removed, etc.

4.4 Use of devices

4.4.1 Control devices

General guidelines and procedures for the use in different regions for: electric fences, cage traps, hunt, hounds, foothold traps, poison ejectors, poison collars and poison bait.

4.4.2 Toxicology

Basic concepts for the safe use of poisons.

4.4.3 Aids

Lures and calling devices.

Version 5.0 - HD de Waal - Version 5.0

5. Address list of organisations that provide specialised training

In a letter dated 26 May 1993[510] to Mr. R.P. O'Moore (Manager: Eastern Cape Agricultural Union, Queenstown), Mr. F.J. van Deventer (MEC: CPA) referred to 'Uniondale Hunt Club' and wrote[511]:

- The letter L6/12/10/70, dated 3 May 1993 addressed to the Administrator was received for attention.
- The matter was reviewed again and the MEC supported the view of the Chief Directorate Nature Conservation that land, which was proclaimed as a Nature Reserve, could not be regarded as 'open land'.
- For many years the Cape Nature Conservation was providing a considerably subsidy to control problem animals, similar to the subsidy payed by the OFS Administration to Oranjejag. In principle, the subsidies were phased out and the Cape Province was following the same policy.

In a letter dated 8 June 1993[512] to Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC), Mrs. Marcelle Meredith (Executive Director: SPCA National Council of Southern Africa) acknowledged receipt of the letter dated 31 March 1993 and wrote: "*We would be grateful to receive a copy of the national Policy Document, if, as was stated in your letter it was approved at your committee meeting held on 6 May 1993*."

In a letter dated 15 June 1993[513] to Mrs. Marcelle Meredith (Executive Director: SPCA National Council of Southern Africa), Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) acknowledged her letter dated 8 June 1993 and attached a copy of the "Nasionale Beleid en Strategie vir Probleemdierbeheer in Suid-Afrika" which was finalised on 18 November 1992[514] and ratified on 6 May 1993. In the document it was emphasised that control of problem animals in South Africa must be aimed at the cost-effective elimination of losses to livestock herds and not the local extermination of species. An apology was offered for the delay in providing the requested document because the personnel structure was rationalised by 50%. She was invited to contact him again if more information was required.

In a letter dated 15 June 1993[515] to Mr. Frans Bussiahn (Predator Control Project, Zoology Department, Rhodes University, Grahamstown), Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) wrote:

"*Herewith the Address and Membership List of members of the National Policy Committee as requested at the Forum for Problem Animal Control*."

In letters dated 22 June 1993[516] to the Director: Department of Agricultural Development (Administration: National Assembly, Elsenburg) and Cedara College of Agriculture, Pietermaritzburg (Attention: Dr. A. van Niekerk), Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) raised the topic of 'Training courses problem animal control':

- The previous letter in this regard was noted by NPAPC at its meeting of 6 May 1993.
- The NPAPC noted that it was not possible to accommodate a complete course in the curriculum of the College, but there was a need for short courses for interested persons during holidays.

[510] File ANR 7/9/5 Executive Committee, Province of the Cape of Good Hope, Cape Town.
[511] Editor's Note: A copy of this letter was only faxed on 9 September 1993 to the Secretary: NPAPC.
[512] File WK 40 (b), NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee, Strategiese Plan.
[513] File WK 40 (b), NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee, Strategiese Plan.
[514] Editor's Note: Erroneously referred to as '1993' in the letter.
[515] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.
[516] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.

Version 5.0 - HG de Waal - Version 5.0

- At the meeting, representatives of the different Provincial Nature Conservation Authorities offered the services of Nature Conservation Scientists as instructors at such short courses.
- Possible dates to present such short courses during 1993 or 1994 would be welcomed. When such information was available, the dates would be forwarded to the different Provincial Nature Conservation Authorities and arrangements would be made for direct liaison between the College and the relevant Authorities.

In a letter dated 22 June 1993[517] to the Editor: Rooivleis, Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) referred to previous correspondence that the National Policy and Strategy for Problem Animal Control in South Africa was finalised on 6 May 1993. The Committee resolved to inquire if the complete Policy Document could be published as an Addendum to Rooivleis. It would enable a broad spectrum of producers first hand insight in the document. The Editor was requested to indicate if it was feasible.

In a letter dated 22 June 1993[518] to Mr. M. Coetzee (Department of Justice, Pretoria), Mr. N.J. Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) referred to a previous letter dated 13 April 1993 (Ref 8/6/diere/1 Coetzee) and wrote regarding 'Legislation: Control of vagrant dogs':

- At the meeting of the NPAPC on 6 May 1993, it was noted with interest that the Minister of Justice broached the possibility of a 'National Dog Act' to incorporate the Provincial Ordinances in a single Act.
- The meeting resolved that the NPAPC would not yet make any input or offer suggestions for the content of such a 'National Dog Act'. When a draft bill of the Act became available, the Department was requested to avail it to the Policy Committee for comments.
- A response could be expected in due course.

In a letter dated 22 June 1993[519] to Mr. J.E. Lensing (Deputy Director: Cape Nature Conservation, Cape Town) and copied to Mr. P.F. Hugo (Chairperson: Breërivier RSC, Worcester), Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) referred to 'Amendment Bill on Animal Matters Act No. 42 of 1993':

- At is meeting on 6 May 1993 the NPAPC noted this Act, which was attached to the Supplementary Addendum to the Agenda (Green). A copy of the Act was attached again.
- After discussion of the matter, the NPAPC recommended that Messrs. Lensing and P.F. Hugo study the Draft Amendment Bill and provide recommendations to the Secretariat for representations to the Chief Directorate Local Management.
- Attached was a copy of a letter to the Chief Directorate Local Management stating that further comments on the Amendment Bill would follow in due course.
- It inquired when the comments from Messrs. Lensing and Hugo could be expected.

In a letter dated 22 June 1993[520] to the Editor: Golden Fleece, Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) referred to previous correspondence that the National Policy and Strategy for Problem Animal Control in South Africa was finalised on 6 May 1993. The Committee resolved to inquire if the complete Policy Document can be published as an Addendum to Golden Fleece. It would enable a broad spectrum of producers first hand insight in the document. The Editor was requested to indicate if it was feasible.

[517] File WK 40 (b), NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee, Strategiese Plan.
[518] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.
[519] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.
[520] File WK 40 (b), NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee, Strategiese Plan.

Version 5.0 - Wo de Waal - Version 5.0

In a letter dated 22 June 1993[521], Mr. N.J. Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) wrote to Mr. G.D. Laws regarding his commitment to translate the Afrikaans version of the National Policy and Strategy for Problem Animal Control in South Africa. On 6 May 1993, the NPAPC Meeting adopted a proposal by Mr. J.E. Lensing that the document be translated to English. Mr. Laws was reminded of his commitment to accept this huge task. The Meeting also requested that the translated version be submitted to Mr. J.E. Lensing for control before it was distributed to the members of the Committee. The Secretariat inquired if Mr. Laws needed any assistance. The next NPAPC Meeting was scheduled for 26 and 27 October 1993; therefore, it would be appreciated if the final product could be received by no later than 30 September 1993.

On 22 June 1993[522] Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) wrote to Mr. G.M. Schutte (Manager: RPO) regarding 'Financing: National Problem Animal Policy Committee':

- The NPAPC meeting on 6 May 1993 agreed in principle that the producers' organisations, NWGA and the RPO would contribute on a 50/50 basis to the proposed budget of R20 000.00 to operate the NPAPC.
- It was also resolved to make submissions to the other participating Authorities sitting on the Policy Committee to contribute the remaining 50% of the Budget. Requests in this regard would be submitted to the MEC's of the four Provinces, as well as the Executive Officer of the RSCs of South Africa. The National Policy Committee held the view that it provided a service in the public interest and to the benefit of the broader community.
- Mr. Vermaak would personally keep Mr. Schutte informed about feedback in this regard from the role players and trusted he was in agreement with the arrangements.
- At the meeting and individual known as 'Frits' said that the RPO had budgeted for a maximum of R3 000.00 as contribution for Secretarial Services in the 1993/94 Budget. At a previous occasion, it was mentioned that the RPO might approach the Meat Board for financial assistance of the Secretarial Services in the form of a 'Special Project'. It was inquired if the RPO could approach the Meat Board to provide the "outstanding" amount of R2 000.00 for the proposed budget of R20 000.00.
- Further inquiry was welcomed if more clarity was needed.

In letters dated 22 June 1993[523] to Mr. F.J. van Deventer (MEC: CPA, Cape Town), Mr. P.J.S. Olivier (MEC: PAO, Bloemfontein), Mr. P.M. Miller (MEC: NPA, Pietermaritzburg) and Mr. S.C.C. Ferreira (MEC: TPA, Pretoria), Mr. N.J. Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) referred to 'Financing: National Problem Animal Policy Committee' and wrote:

- At its meeting on 6 May 1993, the NPAPC discussed the financing of its Secretarial Services.
- In the past it was agreed that the Producer's' Organisations, the NWGA and RPO, would contribute on an equal basis (50:50) towards the budget of the Secretarial Services, and that the other role players would by their attendance and participation in the Policy Committee, were expected to contribute towards the expenses of the Committee's finances.
- Currently the NWGA of South Africa was operating the NPAPC's Secretarial Services, and as stated previously the NWGA and RPO contributed equally to the costs.
- The NWGA proposed a 1993/94 Budget of about R20 000 for the Secretariat Services. However, the RPO indicated that they could only contribute a maximum of R3 000 to the Budget of the Secretarial Services.
- The meeting of 6 May 1993 resolved that the Producer's' Organisations, the NWGA and RPO, would contribute 50% of the estimated budget. Submissions would be made to the

[521] File WK 40 (b), NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee, Strategiese Plan.
[522] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.
[523] File WK 40 (b), NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.

Version 5.0 HO de Waal - Version 5.0

other role players, namely the four Provincial Authorities as well as the RSC and the Natal Parks Board to contribute the remaining 50% of the Budget.

- An amount of R2 500 for the 1993/94 Financial Year per organisation was proposed.
- It was viewed that the National Policy Committee served in the public interest and acted on behalf of the broader Agricultural and Wildlife Association, thus the NPAPC was convinced this was a meritorious case for a "Special Contribution'.
- Mr. P.E. Kingwill (Chairperson: NPAPC) or Mr. N.J. Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) could be contacted for detail.
- A speedy response was requested, if possible not later than 31 August 1993.

In a letter dated 22 June 1993[524] to Mr. C.P. du Plessis (Director: Municipal Association of the Cape Province), Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) referred to 'Collecting Dog Taxes':

- Reference was made to his previous letter of 27 April 1993 (Ref AAO/101/83).
- At its meeting on 6 May 1993 at Golden Gate, the NPAPC noted its content.
- Following discussions, it was decided to make a call to the United Municipal Management to retain the status quo regarding the current Ordinances and Regulations applicable to the control of dogs and dog taxes. Where it seemed that the practical collection of dog taxes was ineffective, it was recommended to apply the collection of taxes permissively.
- The Committee stressed that the principle should apply to allow it for areas or regions where income was still generated from dog taxes.
- The principle was reaffirmed that the problem of vagrant dogs was detrimental for the Small Livestock Industry and the tax system currently remained the only controlling measure for the problem.
- A call was thus made that when any adjustments/amendments were made to the existing system, it should be done with great circumspect and if possible, to apply it within the norms alluded to previously.

In a letter dated 22 June 1993[525] to Mr. Marx (Chief Directorate: Community Services Branch), Mr. N.J. Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) referred to 'Collecting Dog Taxes':

- Reference was made to his previous letter of 27 April 1993 (Ref AAO/101/83).
- At its meeting on 6 May 1993 at Golden Gate the NPAPC noted its content.
- Following discussions, it was decided to make a call to the Chief Directorate Local Management to retain the status quo regarding the current Ordinances and Regulations applicable to the control of dogs and dog taxes. Where it seemed that the practical collection of dog taxes was ineffective, it was recommended to apply the collection of taxes permissively.
- The Committee stressed that the principle should apply to allow it for areas or regions where income was still generated from dog taxes.
- The principle was reaffirmed that the problem of vagrant dogs was detrimental for the Small Livestock Industry and the tax system currently remained the only controlling measure for the problem.
- A call was thus made that when any adjustments/amendments were made to the existing system, it should be done with great circumspect and if possible, to apply it within the norms alluded to previously.
- With reference to the Amendment Bill on Animal Matters Act No. 42 of 1993, the Policy Committee nominated an Action Committee comprising Messrs. J.E. Lensing (Assistant Director: Nature and Environment Conservation, Cape Province) and P.F. Hugo (Chairperson: Breërivier RSC) to evaluate the draft Bill and provide recommendations to Mr. Marx.

[524] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.
[525] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.

Version 5.0 – Ingo de Waal - Version 5.0

In a letter dated 22 June 1993[526] to Mr. F.M. Kritzinger (College Head: Lowveld College of Agriculture, Nelspruit), Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) referred to 'Short Courses: Problem Animal Control at Colleges of Agriculture' and wrote:

- Reference was made to a previous letter dated 7 April 1993, Ref. 16/5/3/1.
- It was noted that sheep farming was not practiced in the Lowveld and no Animal Science training was presented at the College.
- The NPAPC noted at its meeting on 6 May the statement alluded to above. Mr. G.P. Visagie, Director: Nature and Environmental Conservation in Transvaal requested the College should note that bush pigs and vervet monkeys were also regarded as problem animals and that his Department was available to present short courses of 2-3 day duration during holidays or quiet periods to those interested.
- If they were interested in short courses to control the problem animals referred to, they should indicate which dates during 1993 or 1994 would be opportune.

In letters dated 22 June 1993[527] to Mr. F.C. Hayward (for attention at Director: Department of Agricultural Development, Grootfontein Agricultural College, Middelburg, CP), Mr. C.J. Louw (for attention at Director: Department of Agricultural Development, Glen Agricultural College, Glen) and Dr. L.I. de Waal (for attention at Director: Department of Agricultural Development, Highveld Region, Potchefstroom), Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) referred to 'Training Courses Problem Animal Control' and wrote:

- At its meeting on 6 May 1993 the NPAPC noted the previous letter in this regard.
- The National Policy Committee noted that it was not possible to accommodate a complete course as part of the College's curriculum, but that there was a need for short courses during holidays for those interested.
- The different Provincial Nature Conservation Authorities represented on the Policy Committee offered to avail Nature Conservation Scientists to be instructors at the short courses.
- Possible dates to present such short courses in 1993 or 1994 was requested. When the information was received, the dates would be forwarded to the respective Provincial Nature Conservation Authorities and arrangements made for direct liaison between the College and the relevant Authorities.

In a letter undated 22? June 1993[528] to Mr. F.C. Hayward (for attention at Director: Department of Agricultural Development, Grootfontein Agricultural College, Middelburg, CP) and a copy to Mr. J.E. Lensing, Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) referred to 'Problem Animal Control Courses: Grootfontein Agricultural College' and wrote:

- Reference was made to their telephone discussion in this regard.
- As discussed the matter was refereed to Mr. Johan Lensing (with full contact detail).
- Mr. Lensing undertook to liaise directly regarding the course content and extent to finalise a problem animal control course at the College. Best wishes were extended and it was trusted the courses at the College would contribute to successful control of problem animals.

In a letter undated 22? June 1993[529] to Mr. J.E. Lensing (Deputy Director: Cape Nature Conservation, Cape Town), Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) referred to 'Problem Animal Control Courses: Grootfontein Agricultural College' and wrote:

- Reference was made to their telephone discussion in this regard.
- As discussed the full contact detail of Mr. F.C. Hayward was provided.

[526] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.
[527] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.
[528] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.
[529] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

- Mr. Hayward was very enthusiastic about implementing problem animal control courses as part of Grootfontein's curriculum and he would appreciate it if Mr. Lensing could contact him regarding the course content and extent. It was suggested the problem animal control course of the Cape department of Nature and Environment Conservation may be adapted for the needs of the Agricultural College.
- Attached was a letter of Mr. Hayward regarding the matter.
- The Secretariat would appreciate to receive any information on the progress to be included in the Agenda for the forthcoming meeting.

In letters dated 22 June 1993[530] to Mr. J.E. Lensing (Deputy Director: Cape Nature Conservation, Cape Town), Dr. L.P. Stoltz (Directorate: Nature and Environment Conservation, Bloemfontein), Mr. G.D. Laws (Natal Parks Board, Estcourt), Mr. B.R. (Barry) Wilkinson (NPA, Pietermaritzburg), Mr. D.J. Cook (Natal Parks Board, Pietermaritzburg) and Mr. S.W. Wolff (Deputy Director, TPA, Nelspruit), Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) referred to 'Training Course: Competency Private Instructors' and wrote:

- At the recent meeting of the NPAPC on 6 May 1993 at Golden Gate it was resolved that the four Provincial Authorities as well as the Natal Parks Board would be requested to prepare a uniform curriculum of training courses for problem animal hunters and instructors.
- As guideline it was recommended to use the course of the Cape Department of Nature and Environment Conservation and that Provincial Authorities would liaise to finalise the course content and the recommendations be submitted for approval by the National Policy Committee on 27 October 1993.
- It was also resolved that for accreditation of problem animal hunters and instructors under the auspices of the National Policy Committee, the four Provincial Authorities would liaise for the drafting of norms which should apply as competency to act as instructors of problem animal hunters. The principle was also adopted to enable hunters to be accredited for one or more of the control methods, but initially it would be required that a course would refer to all the control methods.
- The Secretariat would appreciate feedback before 31 August 1993 to prepare and include the recommendations as annexure to the Agenda at the forthcoming meeting.

In a letter dated 24 June 1993[531] to Dr. L.P. Stoltz (Directorate: Nature and Environment Conservation, Bloemfontein), Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) referred to 'Future: Oranjejag' and wrote:

- At the Congress of the NWGA Free State Branch, it was noted that Oranjejag could possibly disband. In view of the press release by Oranjejag that it experienced severe financial problems which make it very difficult to provide optimal services, the Oranjejag Executive recommended to its members that the Association should disband, the Congress resolved:
  a. The Department of Nature and Environment of the PAO be requested to remove the Restriction Clause and amend the Regulations and Ordinances to enable producers to control the numbers of problem animals with hunt clubs and by hunting together.
  b. The Provincial Administration be requested to make the money, which was budgeted for Oranjejag available for the envisaged newly established hunt clubs in the Free State to ensure that problem animal numbers can be checked.
- Included was a copy of the memorandum received from a Committee, on behalf of the Smithfield Station. The Chairperson of the Committee was Mr. F.J. du Toit [contact detail]. The memorandum detailed the continuation of activities in the Southern Free State in the name of Oranjejag.
- Feedback was requested on the above and clarity on what the future and policy would be regarding Oranjejag in the Free State in the short and long term.

[530] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.
[531] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.

Version 5.0 - HC do Final - Version 5.0

The following document was attached to the letter of 24 June 1993 to Dr. L.P. Stoltz (Director: Nature and Environment Conservation, Bloemfontein)[532]:

- **Memorandum Smithfield Station to Nature Conservation**
- This memorandum was drafted after several meetings between the districts of Smithfield, Zastron, Rouxville and Bethulie, which were served by the Smithfield Station. The meetings elected an Action Committee to submit the memorandum to the Directorate nature Conservation regarding a decision for the continuation of Oranjejag.
- The Committee from organised agriculture comprised: Chairperson – F.J. du Toit (Smithfield) and Additional Members – C.J. du Plessis (Bethulie), D.C. Snyman (Zastron) and J.J. van Rooyen (Rouxville).
- The name Oranjejag should be retained to continue protection by the Ordinance. Change the Constitution of Oranjejag to make it more streamlined and cost effective.
- <u>Office</u>
- One person of Nature Conservation appointed as the Administrator of Oranjejag and approved by Organised Agriculture. One general office lady.
- <u>Method of operating</u>

1. <u>Administrator</u>

- One person from and appointed by Nature Conservation will be the Administrator. He will act as Manager of the Organisation and, together with representatives of Organised Agriculture, be responsible to deal with the affairs of the Organisation at each station. He would also allocate the Provincial Administration's subsidy fairly between the current Stations, namely: Bloemfontein, Smithfield, Boshof, Fauresmith, Warden and Ventersburg. The subsidy must be divided according to the size of land of the members of each station. Nature Conservation would remunerate the Administrator. The Administrator would act as the authorised representative of the Directorate Nature Conservation.

2. <u>Office lady</u>

- The Office Lady must administrate the income and expenses of each station separately in cooperation with the Administrator. Nature Conservation must provide the office space and other administrative support required. The remuneration of the office lady must be subtracted from the subsidy provided by the Provincial Administration before the remainder was divided between stations.

3. <u>Organised Agriculture</u>

- In each district where a station is located, Organised Agriculture would appoint a person to manage the affairs of that district in cooperation with the Administrator, Office lady and the Hunters. Smithfield, Zastron, Bethulie and Rouxville would each nominate a person for SMITHFIELD STATION.

4. <u>Hunters</u>

- Hunters would remain at each station and continue activities as in the past. Appointments of Hunters would occur in consultation with the station's staff that were appointed by Organised Agriculture. All the Hunters at a station would then handle matters of all parties at the station.

5. <u>Hounds</u>

- The hounds at each station would stay and continue as in the past. The breeding, improvement and increase of the teams would be done at own costs by staff at each station. The breeding hounds of the stations, which were recalled to the Bathurst Station for breeding purposes must be redistributed, prorate to the different stations of Oranjejag for breeding.

[532] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.

version 5.0 - HO de Waal - version 5.0

6. Structural changes

- Changes in structure and appointments would only be done in cooperation with the Representatives of Organised Agriculture and Hunters at the Stations, the Administrator and Nature Conservation.

7. Finances

- Except for the subsidy of the Provincial Administration, each station would be responsible to generate additional income from membership fees etc. to service expenses. Each station must ensure that its budget tallied without having to be subsidised by another station.

8. Members

- Each station would have to recruit members for the organisation. By having more members, the individual contribution of members would be less.

9. Complaints

- Any complaints and problems regarding the stations would be handled and solved by the Administrator, the Hunters and Representatives of organised Agriculture.
- The members of Oranjejag in that region, as well as persons in the small livestock industry in other regions, were concerned about the control of problem animals in future. It was believed the memorandum would be taken seriously, because their future in the small livestock industry was seriously affected by problem animal control. It was also requested to fund a date to discuss the matter, if possible all the regions together, namely Bloemfontein, Smithfield, Boshof and Fauresmith. It was undertake to organise with the other stations to accommodate such a proposed date.
- Attached was included a copy of the letter addressed to the Director of Oranjejag to ensure that the concerns regarding the affairs of Oranjejag was brought to the attention.
- Signed F.J. du Toit (Chairperson).

In a letter dated 25 June 1993[533] to Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC), Mr. Jan Bezuidenhout (Editor: Golden Fleece) acknowledged the letter of 22 June 1993. When the National Policy was announced, the Golden Fleece carried it as a news item. Interested parties were also invited to order a copy from the Secretariat. Therefore, Golden Fleece deemed it sufficient action – unfortunately, it cannot publish the complete document. However, feedback on any successes by the Problem Animal Policy Committee would be published.

In a letter dated 25 June 1993[534] to Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC), Mr. G.M. Schutte (Manager: RPO, Pretoria) referred to 'Problem Animal Control' and wrote:

- Attached was correspondence[535] between an affiliation of the RPO and the Cape Nature Conservation. It was requested the matter be referred to the NPAPC.
- Resolution of the matter could be addressed directly to The Operations Manager, Eastern Cape Agricultural Union (Queenstown), with a copy to the RPO. (Handwritten notes on the letter: posted on 6-7-93 'Spoke by telephone to Van Dyk. He will phone back.' and 'Van Dyk phoned back. Matter was referred to MEC: CPA. He will write a letter'; posted 8-9-93 'Telephone to van Dyk. He undertook to phone back.').

[533] File WK 40 (b), NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee, Strategiese Plan.
[534] File 14/1/8 Red Meat Producers' Organisation, Pretoria.
[535] Editor's Note: reference was made to letters dated 11 December 1992 (Uniondale Farmers Wool and Mohair Growers' Association) and 22 April 1993 (Chief Directorate: Nature and Environmental Conservation).

Version 5.0 HO de Waal, Version 5.0

On 5 July 1993[536] Mr. G.M. Schutte (Manager: RPO) wrote to Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) and acknowledged his letter of 22 June[537] 1993 regarding 'Financing: National Problem Animal Policy Committee':

- The RPO decided to try and make good the 'outstanding' R2 000.00 by savings achieved during the year. Therefore, the Meat Board would not be approached at that stage for a contribution.
- The Minister of Agriculture has just approved the budget of the RPO. Transfers of the budget were made monthly and not in a single large amount. It implied that the full amount of R5 000.00 could not be made in a single transfer.
- Attached was a cheque for R2 500.00 as being the first payment.
- A second cheque for the same amount would be forthcoming in January 1994.
- It was trusted the arrangement was accepted.
- Mr. Vermaak was commended for the very important work did in this regard.

In a letter dated 6 July 1993[538] to the Secretary: NPAPC, Mr. D.J. Matthee (Director: Association of RSCs of the Cape Province, Port Elizabeth) responded regarding 'Financing: National Problem Animal Policy Committee':

- The letter dated 22 January 1993 was referred for the attention to the Director, Association of RSCs of South Africa in Bloemfontein.
- A response would be forthcoming in due course.

In a letter dated 7 July 1993[539] to Mr. N.J. Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC), Mr. G.J.P.B. Willemse (Secretary: Executive Committee) referred to 'Financing: National Problem Animal Policy Committee' and wrote:

- At the request of Mr. P.J.S. Olivier, MEC, receipt of the letter dated 22 January 1993 was acknowledged and the content noted.
- The matter was receiving attention and a response would be forthcoming in due course.

On 7 July 1993[540], Mr. Marx (Deputy Director General: Community Services) wrote to Mr. N.J. Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) regarding 'Collecting Dog Taxes':

- Receipt of the letter dated 22 June 1993 was acknowledged and the content noted.

In a letter dated 8 July 1993[541] to the Secretary: NPAPC (attention: Mr. N.J. Vermaak), Mr. P.M. Miller (MEC: Natal, Problem Animal Control) referred to 'Financing: National Problem Animal Policy Committee' and wrote:

"*Your letter dated 22 June 1993 refers.*

I have referred the matter to the Director General of the Province of Natal in his capacity as accounting officer for the Province, with the recommendation that he investigate ways and means of perhaps making a contribution. However, please understand that this action must not be interpreted as meaning that this Administration has agreed to make such a contribution. It has only agreed to investigate the possibility.

I will arrange for the office of the Director General to liaise with you direct in this regard."

[536] File 14/1/8 Red Meat Producers' Organisation, Pretoria.
[537] Editor's Note: erroneously given as '22 July' instead of '22 June'.
[538] File SDR 3/10/1 Association of Regional Services Councils of the Cape Province, Port Elizabeth.
[539] File PS 18/9/10/8 Executive Committee, Orange Free State Provincial Administration, Bloemfontein.
[540] File AAO/101/83 Community Services Branch, Chief Directorate Local Government, Provincial administration of the Cape of Good Hope, Cape Town.
[541] Executive Committee of the Province of Natal, Pietermaritzburg.

Version 5.0 - PO de Waal - Version 5.0

In letters dated 8 July 1993[542], Mr. P.E. Kingwill[543] (Chairperson: NPAPC) send a circular to all the Provincial Agricultural Unions[544] with specific reference to 'Establishing: Provincial Problem Animal Control Committees' and wrote:

- **Aim and Function**
- A NPAPC was established about two years ago as the result of dissatisfaction among especially small livestock farmers regarding the ineffective control of the losses caused by problem animals.
- The primary goal of the National Policy Committee was to act as a Liaison and Coordinating Forum and direct the power and expertise of the authority and stakeholder groups in agriculture to achieve consensus on policy and approach at the national level regarding aspects of problem animal control. In the current circumstances, it was also imperative to ensure that recommended control methods were ecologically and ethically acceptable.
- The National Policy Committee had a marked influence especially regarding communication, control methods, training, research and development. The committee succeeded to gather a broad spectrum of stakeholders, namely NWGA, RPO, SALU, Problem Animal Control Organisations, RSCs' Association and the Departments of Nature Conservation of all the Provinces around the same table and representatives of these organisations attended the six-monthly meetings of the National Policy Committee.
- **National Policy and Strategy**
- The National Policy Committee drafted with the input and consideration of the different viewpoints of all role players a National Policy and Strategy for Problem Animal Control in South Africa, which have been officially ratified by all the organisations. The National Policy Committee has no executive powers or funds and was depending on all involved organisations to implement the strategies. Therefore, the Committee drafted a Strategic Action Plan, which allocated responsibilities for specific actions to those best equipped to execute it. Both the National Policy Document and the Action Plan were attached for information to show the extent of the initiative and specific detail regarding the objectives.
- **Establishing Provincial Problem Animal Control Committees**
- From the Policy Document and Action Plan it was apparent that the practical implementation of control measures were to be organised and implemented at the local level. Therefore, Problem Animal Control Committees were also needed at the local level. In Natal, a Provincial Problem Animal Control Committee was already operating for several years with very positive results for the community in that region. It was obvious from the allocation of responsibilities in the Action Plan that progress was not possible without these envisaged local committees. It was at this level where the organising, motivation and identification of needs at ground level should take place.
- At a recent meeting the National Policy Committee recommended again that Provincial Problem Animal Control Committees, similar to that in Natal, be established in the different regions where the provincial Agricultural Unions, namely Transvaal, Free State and Western, Eastern and Northern Cape, render services. It was further recommended that these to be established provincial Committees engage all stakeholders at the local level, for example the Provincial Nature Conservation Authorities, Hunt Organisations (when applicable) and possibly the relevant RSCs. For possible financial support of these to be established Committees they may consider approaching the local Provincial or Regional Authorities and the RSCs for contributions.

[542] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.
[543] Editor's Note: Letter was dictated by Mr. Kingwill and in his absence signed by Mr. N.J. Vermaak (Secretary.
[544] Editor's Note: File WK40 - Western Cape Agricultural Union, Paarl; Eastern Cape Agricultural Union, Queenstown; Northern Cape Agricultural Union, Kimberley; Free State Agricultural Union, Bloemfontein; Natal Agricultural Union, Pietermaritzburg; Transvaal Agricultural Union, Silverton.

Version 5.0 - Incl. Appendices - Version 5.0

- On behalf of the NPAPC, it was requested that the matter be submitted to the Executive Council with the request that this initiative be taken to establish such a committee for the agricultural Union's region. The committee would also provide liaison with the National Policy Committee and implementation of actions at ground levels. The National Secretariat as well as the existing Problem Animal Control Committee in Natal may provide any additional information or assistance as required.
- **Representation on National Policy Committee**
- Although no firm decision has been taken in this regard, it may be best if the Chairperson of every Provincial Problem Animal Control Committee served as representative on the National policy Committee to ensure continuous and effective liaison.
- At the National Policy Committee, the arrangement was that every organisation carried the cost of its representative and contribute pro rata towards the cost of the Secretariat. Such an arrangement may also be meaningful at regional level where meetings may be coordinated with other Agricultural Union meetings.
- **Positive consequences**
- A practical consequence of the initiative to engage all role players involved in problem animal control was the Problem Animal Control Forum that was recently convened under the auspices of the National Policy Committee at Golden Gate on 4 and 5 May 1993. Valuable information was shared among all stakeholders including farmers, problem animal hunters, nature conservation scientists as well as representatives of RSCs and Provincial Authorities, which could contribute at a broad level to the effective control of problem animals.
- It would be appreciated if the matter could be given high priority. The difficult economic situation which agriculture currently experiences did not allow for unnecessary large losses of livestock to predation.
- Cooperation was appreciated.

In a letter dated 8 July 1993[545] to Mr. N.J. Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC), Mr. J.E. Lensing (Deputy Director: Cape Nature Conservation, Cape Town) referred to 'Legislation regarding Vagrant Dogs':

- With reference to the letter of 22 June 1993, there was an apparent misunderstanding about the committee's decisions at its recent meeting on 6 May at the Golden Gate National Park regarding the matter, but without a copy of the minutes to verify he had to rely on memory.
- According to his recollecting it was decided that Messrs. Lensing and Hugo should meet on behalf of the committee with the Chief Directorate Local Management of the Cape Province regarding the proposed amendments of the Ordinance on Dog Taxes in the Cape Province with a view to prevent that control over dog numbers in rural areas do not collapse. Feedback showed that the amendments have not made too much progress and there would be sufficient time to provide input. Arrangements were made to meet with the relevant officials on 12 August.
- The Amendment Bill on Animal Matters has been adopted and no comments could be submitted anymore to the Draft Bill. It also did not resort under the Chief Directorate Local Management, but under the Department of Justice. As mentioned at the meeting, its stipulations could in any case not contribute much to a solution for the problem, therefore it was suggested it was dropped from further discussions to prevent any further confusion.

In an undated letter[546] to Mr. J.E. Lensing (Cape Town), Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) referred to 'Legislation regarding Vagrant Dogs':

- The letter of 8 July 1993 (Ref ANO 7/138) was acknowledged.

[545] File ANO 7/138, Head Office, Cape Nature Conservation, Cape Provincial Administration, Cape Town.
[546] File WK 40D, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal Version 5.0

- The content of the letter was noted and the Secretariat looked forward to receive feedback on the matter after discussions on 12 August 1993 with the Department and relevant officials.

In letters dated 9 July 1993[547] to the Chief Directorate: Natal Parks Board, Pietermaritzburg (attention: Mr. D. Cook), the Director: Nature and Environment Conservation, Bloemfontein (attention: Mr. N. Ferreira) and the Chief Director: Nature and Environment Conservation, Pretoria (dated 8 July 1993/attention: G.P. Visagie), Mr. J.E. Lensing (Deputy Director: Cape Nature Conservation, Cape Town) referred to 'Establishing Norms for the Accreditation of Problem Animal Instructors and Hunters by the NPAPC' and wrote:

1. Reference was made to the third paragraph of the attached letter by the NPAPC.
2. It was suggested that the envisaged norms be kept as simple as possible to ensure maximum flexibility in the registration process. The Cape Provincial Nature Conservation thus suggested the following guidelines.

2.1 For problem animal hunters:

- The successful completion of a training course in the control method applied for registration, which was presented by one of the nature conservation authorities, an accredited instructor, a technicon or agricultural college.
- Possessed a certificate of competency for control methods for which it was required.
- The completion of a period of practical problem animal control under supervision of an accredited problem animal hunter or a person who would qualify for accreditation as a problem animal hunter (*i.e*. an 'apprenticeship').
- The successful completion of problem animal control operations or research in which some of the applicable control methods were used.
- On application for registration, sign an undertaking to comply at all times with the code of practice of problem animal control.

2.2 For instructors: all the above plus:

- Two years of applicable experience as problem animal hunter.
- Submitting course content which was acceptable for the committee

  Documents to support compliance of all the requirements must accompany the application for registration.

3. It would be appreciated if the comments on or additions to the guidelines which were applicable to a province could be forwarded to reach him before 15 August 1993 for collation and further editing by the Secretary of the Policy Committee.

On 13 July 1993[548] Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) wrote to Mr. G.M. Schutte (Manager: RPO) in acknowledgement of his letter of 5 July 1993 regarding 'Financing: National Problem Animal Policy Committee':

- On behalf of the Chairperson of the Committee, appreciation was expressed once again to the RPO for its contribution to the Secretariat of the NPAPC.
- In the depressed financial position currently experienced by the RPO and NWGA, the contribution was appreciated and every effort would be made to spend it wisely.

In a letter dated 14 July 1993[549] to Mr. D.J. Matthee (Chief Executive Officer: RSCs, Port Elizabeth) and copied to Mr. P.F. Hugo (Worcester), Mr. P.E. Kingwill[550] (Chairperson: NPAPC) alluded to a circular addressed to Provincial Agricultural Unions with specific reference to 'Establishing: Provincial Problem Animal Control Committees' and wrote:

[547] File ANO 9/18, Head Office, Cape Nature Conservation, Cape Provincial Administration, Cape Town.
[548] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.
[549] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.
[550] Editor's Note: Letter was dictated by Mr. Kingwill and in his absence signed by Mr. N.J. Vermaak (Secretary.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

- A NPAPC was established about two years ago as the result of dissatisfaction among especially small livestock farmers regarding the ineffective control of the losses caused by problem animals.
- The primary goal of the National Policy Committee was to act as a Liaison and Coordinating Forum and direct the power and expertise of the authority and stakeholder groups in agriculture to achieve consensus on policy and approach at the national level regarding aspects of problem animal control. In the current circumstances, it was also imperative to ensure that recommended control methods were ecologically and ethically acceptable.
- The National Policy Committee had a marked influence especially regarding communication, control methods, training, research and development. The committee succeeded to gather a broad spectrum of stakeholders, namely NWGA, RPO, SALU, Problem Animal Control Organisations, RSCs' Association and the Departments of Nature Conservation of all the Provinces around the same table and representatives of these organisations attended the six-monthly meetings of the National Policy Committee.
- Mr. P.F. Hugo, on behalf of the Breërivier RSC, was nominated to represent the Executive Council of the RSC on the Policy Committee.
- **National Policy and Strategy**
- The National Policy Committee drafted with the input and consideration of the different viewpoints of all role players a National Policy and Strategy for Problem Animal Control in South Africa, which have been officially ratified by all the organisations. The National Policy Committee has no executive powers or funds and was depending on all involved organisations to implement the strategies. Therefore, the Committee drafted a Strategic Action Plan, which allocated responsibilities for specific actions to those best equipped to execute it. Both the National Policy Document and the Action Plan were attached for information to show the extent of the initiative and specific detail regarding the objectives.
- **Establishing Provincial Problem Animal Control Committees**
- From the Policy Document and Action Plan it was apparent that the practical implementation of control measures were to be organised and implemented at the local level. Therefore, Problem Animal Control Committees were also needed at the local level. In Natal, a Provincial Problem Animal Control Committee was already operating for several years with very positive results for the community in that region. It was obvious from the allocation of responsibilities in the Action Plan that progress was not possible without these envisaged local committees. It was at this level where the organising, motivation and identification of needs at ground level should take place.
- At a recent meeting the National Policy Committee recommended again that Provincial Problem Animal Control Committees, similar to that in Natal, be established in the different regions where the provincial Agricultural Unions, namely Transvaal, Free State and Western, Eastern and Northern Cape, render services. It was further recommended that these to be established provincial Committees engage all stakeholders at the local level, for example the Provincial Nature Conservation Authorities, Hunt Organisations (when applicable) and possibly the relevant RSCs. For possible financial support of these to be established Committees they may consider approaching the local Provincial or Regional Authorities and the RSCs for contributions.
- Similar to this, letters have also been directed to the Executives of the Agricultural Unions in South Africa with the request to take the initiative in establishing Provincial Problem Animal Control Committees in each region. Mr. P.F. Hugo, on behalf of the RSC, has also requested the Policy Committee to approach the Executive Council of the RSC to ensure they cooperate with the respective Agricultural Unions in this regard and be involved from the start with the established Provincial Committees. These Committees would also provide liaison with the National Policy Committee and implementation of actions at ground levels. The National

Version 5.0 - NO as Year - Version 5.0

Secretariat as well as the existing Problem Animal Control Committee in Natal may provide any additional information or assistance as required.

- **Representation on National Policy Committee**
- Although no firm decision has been taken in this regard, it may be best if the Chairperson of every Provincial Problem Animal Control Committee served as representative on the National policy Committee to ensure continuous and effective liaison.
- At the National Policy Committee, the arrangement was that every organisation carried the cost of its representative and contribute pro rata towards the cost of the Secretariat. Such an arrangement may also be meaningful at regional level where meetings may be coordinated with other Agricultural Union meetings.
- **Positive consequences**
- A practical consequence of the initiative to engage all role players involved in problem animal control was the Problem Animal Control Forum that was recently convened under the auspices of the National Policy Committee at Golden Gate on 4 and 5 May 1993. Valuable information was shared among all stakeholders including farmers, problem animal hunters, nature conservation scientists as well as representatives of RSCs and Provincial Authorities, which could contribute at a broad level to the effective control of problem animals.
- It would be appreciated if the matter could be given high priority. The difficult economic situation which agriculture currently experiences did not allow for unnecessary large losses of livestock to predation.
- Cooperation was appreciated.

In a letter dated 14 July 1993[551] to Mr. N.J. Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC), Mr. J.S. Botha (for General Manager: Western Cape Agricultural Union, Paarl) wrote regarding 'Establishing: Provincial Problem Animal Control Committees':

- Receipt of the letter dated 8 July 1993 (Ref WK40) with annexures was acknowledged.
- The Union was referring the letter to the Western Cape Agricultural Union RPO for their comments and suggestions to handle it further. The RPO Executive was meeting at the end of August 1993 and thereafter feedback would be given.

In a letter dated 15 July 1993[552] to Mr. N.J. Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC), Mr. B.R. Wilkinson (Director-General: NPA, Pietermaritzburg) referred to 'Financing of the Secretarial Services of the National Problem Animal Policy Committee' and wrote:

"*As requested at the last meeting of the Policy Committee, the possibility of the Natal Provincial Administration contributing to the financing of the secretariat of the committee has been considered.*

It must be acknowledged at the outset that the amount of financial assistance requested is modest and I have no reservations in principle to supporting the request. There is, however, a stumbling block in that no provision was made in the current estimates for this expenditure. Accordingly the only way in which such expenditure could be met would be from any possible savings which may be incurred.

Your application has accordingly been placed on record for consideration later in the financial year in the light of any savings which may be projected.

A further communication will accordingly be addressed to you in due course."

On 15 July 1993, the recurring poor financial situation of Oranjejag over many years, the inevitable happened and it was officially dissolved; only two months after the momentous Problem Animal Control Forum was held on 4 – 5 May 1993 at the Golden Gate Highlands National Park, Orange Free State Province.

[551] File Western Cape Agricultural Union, Paarl.
[552] File 2/4/251/1 Natal Provincial Administration, Pietermaritzburg.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

In a letter dated 26 July 1993[553] to Mr. P.E. Kingwill (Chairperson: National Problem Animal Committee), Mr. D.J. Matthee (Director: Association of RSCs of the Cape Province) acknowledged the letter dated 14 July 1993 (WK 40) and wrote:

- The letter regarding 'Establishing: Provincial Problem Animal Control Committees' with annexures was referred to the Director, Association of RSC of South Africa in Bloemfontein for submission to the Executive Board of the Association.
- A letter in this regard could be expected in due course from the relevant Director.

In a letter dated 26 July 1993[554] to Mr. N.J. Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC), Mr. C.J. Louw referred to 'Training courses problem animal control' and wrote:

- He referred to their telephone conversation on 16 July 1993.
- A problem animal course was organised and presented on 20 and 21 July 1993 by Mr. Kassie du Plessis of the Rural Foundation. The course was attended by 25 to 30 persons. As indicated in the telephone conversation no further courses would be organised.
- They were currently contemplating the possibility to extend the training with a third year following the 2- year diploma course. It was considered to include short courses in problem animal control for those students and farmers who may be interested.
- It would be appreciated if the content of such a proposed course could be obtained.

In a letter dated 29 July 1993[555] to Mr. N.J. Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC), Mr. J.J. Blom (Directorate: Nature and Environment Conservation, Bloemfontein) referred to 'Training Course: Competency of Private Instructors' and wrote:

1. Reference was made to the letter of 22 June 1993.
2. The matter was communicated in writing with Mr. J.E. Lensing, Cape Nature Conservation who acted as coordinator for this matter.
3. It was trusted Mr. Lensing would soon communicate with the Secretariat regarding the matter which would include the proposals and comments of the OFS Nature and Environment Conservation.

In an undated letter July 1993 (receipt date stamped 9 August 1993)[556] to Mr. J.E. Lensing (Chief Directorate: Cape Nature Conservation and Museums, Cape Town), Mr. J.J. Blom (Directorate: Nature and Environment Conservation, Bloemfontein) referred to 'Training courses in problem animal control: establishing uniform standards for hunters and instructors' and wrote:

1. Reference was made to the letters dated 1 February 1993, 8 July 1993 and 9 July 1993 regarding the request of the NPAPC in this regard.
2. An apology was offered for the delay in responding because inexplicably the correspondence did not reach the correct end point.
3. Comments on paragraph 3 of the letter dated 1 February, the following:
   - The OFS Directorate Nature and Environment Conservation was satisfied and agreed that the Problem Animal Control Training Manual of the Cape Nature Conservation could serve as guideline to present problem animal courses.
4. Comments on paragraph 2.1 of the letter dated 9 July 1993, the following:
   - When problem animal control courses were presented by technicons or colleges of agriculture, the relevant course content must be approved by the relevant nature

[553] File SDR 3/10/1 Association of Regional Services Councils of the Cape Province, Port Elizabeth.
[554] File 10/2/3/4 Glen College of Agricultural, Glen Agricultural Development Institute, Glen.
[555] File N3/2/13/1 Directorate: Nature & Environmental Conservation, Orange Free State Provincial Administration.
[556] File N3/2/13/1 Directorate: Nature & Environmental Conservation, Orange Free State Provincial Administration.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

conservation authority. Nature Conservationists may also contribute positively to the courses by presenting certain aspects;

- A problem may well arose for the attendance of a practical period under supervision of an accredited hunter if a landowner only wanted to control problem animals on his own land or those of two or three neighbours. It was proposed that such farmers with a long-standing knowledge of the subject only be subjected to a strict practical field test to qualify.

5. Lastly it was proposed that the course content and examination papers be drafted according to the requirements of each province and that the pass level be set at 60%, in other words for 60% for theory and 60% for practical.
6. For any questions, he could be contacted.

In a letter dated 29 July 1993[557] to Mr. N.J. Vermaak (NWGA of SA), Mr. N.A. Ferreira (Directorate: Nature and Environment Conservation, Bloemfontein) referred to 'Future of Oranjejag' and wrote:

1. Receipt of the letter dated 24 June 1993 was acknowledged.
2. In accordance with an Executive Committee resolution, Oranjejag was disbanded on 15 July 1993.
3. The regulations of the Ordinance on Nature Conservation (Ord. 8 of 1969) has already been changed to allow private hunters, hunt clubs and landowners to control problem animals in the OFS themselves.
4. The remainder of the subsidy to Oranjejag from the Provincial Administration for the financial year would be used to assist those hunters from Oranjejag who privatised to get on their feet. That was in accordance with the support guidelines to authorities as contained in the National Policy and Strategy for Problem Animal Control in South Africa.
5. The Directorate has also stated with training of groups of farmers to help themselves with predator problems. Because of the extent of the problem and that only small groups were trained at a time, the training of small stock farmers would be implemented and adjusted over a long period of time.
6. The memorandum of the committee at Smithfield and its Chairperson Mr. F.J. du Toit was noted. The matter has been discussed and finalised with a delegation from the Committee.

In a letter dated 2 August 1993[558] to Mr. N.J. Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC), Mr. V. van der Westhuizen (College Head: Potchefstroom College of Agriculture) referred to 'Training courses Problem Animal Control' and wrote:

- They were planning to accommodate a short course in Problem Animal Control, on an elective basis, in the curriculum of the College.
- They have already arranged with the Director: Nature Conservation in Pretoria for presenting the course. The Directorate was already presenting such courses and would adapt it to comply with the needs of the College. The first course would be presented in May 1994. The dates would be finalised at a later stage.

In an undated letter in August 1993[559] to Mr. C.J. Louw (Glen College of Agriculture) and copied to Dr. L.P. Stoltz (Director: Nature and Environment Conservation, OFS), Mr. N.J. Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) referred to 'Problem animal control courses: Glen College of Agriculture' and wrote:

- Reference was made to their telephone conversation.
- The matter was referred to Dr. L.P. Stoltz, Director: Nature and Environment Conservation, Bloemfontein. Dr. Stoltz could be contacted [contact detail].

[557] File N10/1/81 Directorate: Nature & Environmental Conservation, Orange Free State Provincial Administration.
[558] File 14/2/1 Department of Agricultural Development, Administration: House of Assembly, Potchefstroom.
[559] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

- Dr. Stoltz undertook to make contact to determine and finalise the extent and content of a course in problem animal control at the College. Best wishes were extended and it was trusted the courses at the College would contribute to the successful control of problem animals.

In an undated letter in August 1993[560] to Dr. L.P. Stoltz (Director: Nature and Environment Conservation, OFS), Mr. N.J. Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) referred to 'Problem animal control courses: Glen College of Agriculture' and wrote:

- Reference was made to their telephone conversation.
- As discussed, Mr. C.J. Louw envisaged to include organised courses in problem animal control at the College the next year.
- It would be appreciated if assistance and guidance could be provided to the Glen College of Agriculture [contact detail] to present courses in problem animal control.
- Feedback on the progress would be appreciated to report it at the forthcoming meeting of the NPAPC
- A copy of the letter was provided to Mr. C.J. Louw.

In a fax dated 23 August 1993[561] to Mr. N.J. Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC), 'Sonja' (Personnel Secretary of Mr. R.E. Redinger, MEC), wrote:

- Mr. Redinger is now the MEC in place of Mr. Peter Miller. He is the MEC for Health and Health Services. It was requested that all further documents be addressed to Mr. R.E. Redinger, MEC (Pietermaritzburg address).

In a letter dated 26 August 1993[562] to Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC), Dr. W.R. Hoods (MEC: TPA, Pretoria) referred to 'Financing: National Problem Animal Policy Committee' and wrote:

- He was currently responsible for nature conservation; therefore, he took the liberty to respond to the letter dated 22 June 1993, which was addressed to Mr. Ferreira.
- Because of funds and specific restrictions on expenditure in the province, it was unfortunately not possible to comply with the request.

In a letter dated 30 August 1993[563] to Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC), Mr. J.M. Laubscher (Manager: Operations and General Services) referred to 'Request for Establishing: Provincial Problem Animal Control Committee' and wrote:

- The letter dated 8 July 1993 was referred for attention to the Executive of the Northern Cape Red Meat Producers' Organisation (NKRPO).
- After due discussion and also cognisant of previous discussions in this regard by the RPO's erstwhile Executive, as well as the view to prevent excessive organisation, the NKRPO Executive did not deem it at that stage necessary to establish a Problem Animal Control Committee for the Northern Cape. It was also deemed sufficient for all actions, which should be filtered down to ground level, to be effectively, addressed via the RPO and NWGA to the Northern Cape Agricultural Union, as well as its farmers unions and farmers associations.

In a letter dated 2 September 1993[564] to Mr. N.J. Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC), Mr. P.J.S. Olivier (MEC: PAO, Bloemfontein) referred to 'Financing: National Problem Animal Policy Committee' and wrote:

[560] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.
[561] File Executive Committee of the Province of Natal, Pietermaritzburg.
[562] File TN 1/11/4/65 Executive Committee, Transvaal Provincial Administration, Pretoria.
[563] File B/1/13 Northern Cape Agricultural Union, Kimberley.
[564] File PS 18/9/10/8 & N10/1/81 Executive Committee, Orange Free State Provincial Administration, Bloemfontein.

Version 5.0 - Hoe Waar - Version 5.0

- Reference was made to the letter dated 22 January 1993.
- The Administration has made a huge contribution to problem animal control in the 1993/94 financial year. A subsidy of R350 000 was paid to the erstwhile Oranjejag, which was responsible for problem animal control in the Orange Free State. The remainder of the subsidy budgeted for the 1993/94 financial year, namely R329 000 was earmarked for problem animal management in the Orange Free State. In view of the above, the Administration did not see its way open to request extra funds for the NPAPC.
- It was trusted the situation was appreciated.

In a fax message dated 9 September 1993[565] to Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC), Mr. M. van Dyk (for Chief Directorate: Nature and Environmental Conservation) referred to 'Uniondale Hunt Club' and wrote:

- Reference was made to the telephone conversation on 9 September 1993[566].
- Attached was a copy of the letter dated 26 May 1993 (Ref. ANR 7/9/5)[567] for his attention.

On 9 September 1993[568], Prof. G.F. Bath (Faculty of Veterinary Science, University of Pretoria) wrote to Mr. N.J. Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) and, with reference to the Problem Animal Control: Policy and Strategy which was recently publicised in the Golden Fleece, requested three copies of the document. (Handwritten note on the letter: posted 17 September 1993).

In an undated letter[569] (date stamped 9 September 1993 by NWGA) to Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC), Mr. B.R. Wilkinson (for Director-General: NPA, Pietermaritzburg) referred to 'Training Course: Competency Private Instructors' and wrote:

- Reference was made to the letter of 22 June 1993.
- At the recent meeting of the 'Advisory Committee on Problem Animal Control' resolved that the Natal Parks Board would tackle the above-mentioned matter, because the NPA had no input to make.
- It was also mentioned that Mr. R.E. Redinger was appointed as MEC in the place of Mr. P.M. Miller who had recently retired.

In a letter dated 14 September 1993[570] to Mr. J.E. Lensing (Deputy Director: Cape Nature Conservation, Cape Town), Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) referred to 'Training Course: Competency Private Instructors' and wrote:

- Reference was made to the letter of 22 June 1993.
- As stated, at the recent meeting of the NPAPC on 6 May 1993 at Golden Gate it was resolved that the four Provincial Authorities as well as the Natal Parks Board would be requested to prepare a uniform curriculum of training courses for problem animal hunters and instructors.
- Feedback was received from Dr. L. Stoltz on behalf of the Orange Free State Directorate: Nature and Environment Conservation. A copy of the letter was included. It stated that Mr. Lensing was the coordinator in this matter and the proposals and comments would be submitted to the Secretariat.

[565] File ANR 7/9/5 Chief Directorate: Nature and Environmental Conservation, Cape Provincial Administration.
[566] Editor's Note: see the RPO's letter dated 25 June 1993, as well as previous related correspondence.
[567] Editor's Note: letter was filed at 26/5/1993 (its chronological order).
[568] File WK 40 (b), NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee, Strategiese Plan.
[569] File 2/4/251/1 Natal Provincial Administration, Pietermaritzburg.
[570] File WK 40D, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

- It was inquired about the progress with the matter and it would be appreciated if any comments could be received by the Secretariat by 30 September 1993 for inclusion in the Agenda of the meeting on 27 October 1993.

In a letter dated 14 September 1993[571] to Mr. J.E. Lensing (Directorate: Nature and Environment, Cape Province), Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) referred to 'Legislation regarding Vagrant Dogs':

- Reference was made to the letter of 8 July 1993 (Ref ANO 7/138).
- It stated that discussions with the relevant officials was scheduled for 12 August 1993.
- Feedback regarding the discussions would be appreciated by the Secretariat.

In a letter dated 14 September 1993[572] to Mr. J.S. Botha (for General Manager: Western Cape Agricultural Union, Paarl), Mr. N.J. Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) wrote regarding 'Establishing: Provincial Problem Animal Control Committees':

- Reference was made to the letter dated 14 July 1993.
- It was noted with appreciation that the matter was referred to the Western Cape Agricultural Union RPO, and that the RPO Executive was meeting at the end of August 1993 regarding the matter.
- The forthcoming meeting of the NPAPC was scheduled for 27 October 1993; therefore, it would be appreciated to receive response on the matter in order to communicate it with the NPAPC at the meeting.

In letters dated 14 September 1993[573] to Mr. O'Moore (Manager: Eastern Cape Agricultural Union, Queenstown), Mr. Shone (Director: Natal Agricultural Union, Pietermaritzburg) and Mr. J.C.R. Hartman (General Manager: Transvaal Agricultural Union, Silverton), Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) referred to 'Establishing: Provincial Problem Animal Control Committees' and wrote:

- Reference was made to the letter dated 8 July 1993 (Ref. WK 40).
- The forthcoming meeting of the NPAPC was scheduled for 27 October 1993; therefore, it would be appreciated to receive response on the matter in order to communicate it with the NPAPC at the meeting.

On 14 September 1993[574] Mr. N.J. Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) wrote to Mrs. M.E. Olckers (MEC: CPA) regarding the 'Financing: National Problem Animal Policy Committee':

- Reference was made to a previous letter dated 22 June 1993 to Mr. F.J. van Deventer (MEC: Province of the Cape of Good Hope).
- For her information, a copy of the letter was attached. The Secretariat would appreciate feedback on the feasibility of the proposals.
- For more information, she could contact the Secretary or Chairperson of the NPAPC, Mr. P.E. Kingwill.
- They were looking forward to meeting the MEC at the forthcoming meeting on 27 October 1993.

In a letter dated 14 September 1993[575] to the Director: Association of RSCs of South Africa (Bloemfontein), Mr. N.J. Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) referred to his letter dated 22 June 1993 (regarding 'Financing: National Problem Animal Policy Committee'), which was

[571] File WK 40D, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.
[572] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.
[573] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.
[574] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.
[575] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.

Version 6.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

forwarded by Mr. D.J. Matthee (Director: RSCs of the Cape Province) and inquired when the Secretariat could expect a response.

In a letter dated 14 September 1993[576] to the Director: Association of RSCs (Bloemfontein) regarding 'Establishing: Provincial Problem Animal Control Committees', Mr. N.J. Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) referred to his letter dated 14 July 1993 (WK 40) and wrote:

- A letter was received from Mr. D.J. Matthee, Director: RSCs of the Cape Province, stating that the letter was provided for your attention and an answer could be expected in due course.
- The forthcoming meeting of the Policy Committee was scheduled for 27 October 1993; therefore, the Association's response was required to inform members of the Committee of its decision.

On 14 September 1993[577], Mr. N.J. Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) referred Mr. G.D. Laws to his previous letter of 22 June 1993 regarding the English version of the National Policy and Strategy for Problem Animal Control in South Africa. He reminded Mr. Laws again of the deadline of 30 September 1993 and offered the assistance of the Secretariat if required.

In a letter dated 16 September 1993[578] to Mr. B.R. Wilkinson (Director-General: NPA, Pietermaritzburg), Mr. N.J. Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) referred to 'Financing of the Secretarial Services of the National Problem Animal Policy Committee' and wrote:

"*Your previous letter dated 15 July 1993, reference 2/4/251/1 refers.*

We took note of the contents of your letter and would like to know if any progress in this regard has been made.

In a letter dated 17 September 1993[579] to Mr. L. de Jager (General Manager: Free State Agricultural Union, Bloemfontein), Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) referred to 'Establishing: Provincial Problem Animal Control Committees' and wrote:

- Reference was made to the letter dated 8 July 1993 (Ref. WK 40).
- The forthcoming meeting of the NPAPC was scheduled for 27 October 1993; therefore, it would be appreciated to receive response on the matter in order to communicate it with the NPAPC at the meeting.

In a letter dated 16 September 1993[580] to Mr. N.J. Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC), Mr. J.E. Lensing (Deputy Director: Cape Nature Conservation, Cape Town) referred to 'Legislation regarding Vagrant Dogs':

- Pursuant to his letter of 8 July 1993, Messrs. Lensing and P.F. Hugo (Association of RSCs), as well as officials of the Breërivier RSC and the Cape Nature Conservation, with Mr. F. Marx of the Chief Directorate Local Management on 19 August 1993, provided feedback on the meeting, which was attended.
- The results of the discussions were:

1. Currently the amendments to the Ordinance on Dog Taxes was not a priority for Local Management and would not receive attention in the near future. They were also not satisfied with the draft ordinance that was received and aimed to revise it comprehensively at a later stage.

[576] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.
[577] File WK 40 (b), NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee, Strategiese Plan.
[578] File WK 40D, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.
[579] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.
[580] File ANO 7/138, Head Office, Cape Nature Conservation, Cape Provincial Administration, Cape Town.

Version 5.0 - Hilo de Waal - Version 5.0

2. Local Management noted the positions of the Problem Animal Policy Committee and showed understanding for it. They undertook to consider it when drafting a comprehensive revised draft.
3. Local Management would consult with a broader group stakeholders (e.g. agricultural unions) when revising the draft and would engage the Problem Animal Policy Committee.

- A copy of the letter was provided to the Chief Directorate Local Management and was therefore not necessary for the committee to taken for the present any further action.

In a fax communication dated 17 September 1993[581] to Mrs. Willa Green (Free State Agricultural Union, Bloemfontein), Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) wrote the following handwritten note:

- Please hand the attached documents[582] to Mrs. W. Green.

In a letter dated 17 September 1993[583] to Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC), Mr. J.E. Lensing (Deputy Director: Cape Nature Conservation, Cape Town) referred to 'Establishing Norms for the Accreditation of Problem Animal Instructors and Hunters by the National Problem Animal Policy Committee' and wrote:

- Attached were copies of the correspondence with the other provinces on this matter.
- Only the OFS has reacted to the letter and it was accepted that the other provinces were in agreement with the proposed norms.
- Regarding the OFS's comments the following:
- Par. 4(a): The implication was that the courses of the agricultural colleges and technicon should also be registered with the policy committee (or Labour). No problem with it provided that it is understood competency certificates could not be issued on that basis only.
- Par. 4(b): Individual farmers who hunted for themselves or a few neighbours did not have to be accredited.
- Par. 5: In agreement.
- For further editing and submission to the committee.

In a letter dated 17 September 1993[584] to Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC), Mr. Johan Lensing (Assistant Director: Nature and Environment Conservation) referred to 'Courses in Problem Animal Control: Establishing a uniform national standard':

- Attached was copies of correspondence with other provinces[585] in this regard.
- According to letters, both Natal and the Free State were in favour of the manual used by the Cape with provision for differences in the circumstances of each region. Transvaal said the regional differences were very big and suggested a framework syllabus for the course.
- It seems that a comprehensive single manual for the country was not feasible for the reasons stated. It was suggested that the Committee only adopted a framework to which the content of any course or manual, presented by whoever, must comply. The framework suggested by Transvaal was acceptable provided provision was made for inclusion of safety and precautionary measures in the course material.

In a letter dated 27 September 1993[586] to Mr. N.J. Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC), Mr. K. Pillay (for Director-General: NPA, Pietermaritzburg) referred to 'Financing of the Secretarial Services of the National Problem Animal Policy Committee' and wrote:

[581] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.
[582] Editor's Note: a reference to the 'Establishing: Provincial Problem Animal Committees' dated 8 July 1993.
[583] File ANO 9/18, Head Office, Cape Nature Conservation, Cape Provincial Administration, Cape Town.
[584] File ANO 9/18, Head Office, Cape Nature Conservation, Cape Provincial Administration, Cape Town.
[585] Editor's Note: Attached was a letter from Mr. D.J. Cook, Natal Parks Board, dated 18 March 1993 addressed to Mr. J. Lensing, Cape Nature Conservation.
[586] File 2/4/251/1 Natal Provincial Administration, Pietermaritzburg.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

"*I refer to your letter 16 September 1993 in the above regards and advise that I will only be in a position to advise you toward the end of the financial year i.e. early in 1994.*

In a letter dated 28 September 1993[587] to Mr. Bezuidenhout (Operations Manager: Eastern Cape Agricultural Union, Queenstown) and copied to Mr. F. de Jager (Assistant Manager: RPO, Pretoria), Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) referred to 'Problem Animal Control: Uniondale Hunt Club' and wrote:

- Reference was made to the letter dated 30 June 1993 received from Mr. F. de Jager (Assistant Manager: RPO). A copy of the letter was attached.
- The Secretariat: NPAPC engaged on the matter with Mr. M. van Dyk of the Cape Department Nature and Environment Conservation.
- Based on a legal opinion of the Administration's legal advisors, Mr. van Dyk said it was decided not to make a financial contribution to the Uniondale Hunt Club. A copy of the Administration's letter of 22 April 1993 to the Eastern Cape Agricultural Union was attached.
- In an additional inquiry to the Administration, a letter[588] was received from the Mr. F.J. van Deventer (MEC: CPA). It stated that subsidies were being phased out and it was not deemed fit to contribute to the Uniondale Hunt Club.
- From the above it was clear that the Executive Committee of the CPA was not considering to contribute to the Uniondale Hunt Club.
- A possible route to follow would be for the Uniondale Farmers Association to formulate a discussion point for discussion at a Congress of the Eastern Cape RPO, where invited members of the CPA could first hand gain information and respond to questions.

In a letter dated 28 September 1993[589] to Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC), Mr. R.P. O'Moore (Manager: Eastern Cape Agricultural Union, Queenstown) referred to 'Establishing: Provincial Problem Animal Control Committees' and wrote:

- Reference was made to the letters of 8 July and 14 September 1993 (Ref. WK 40).
- At its meeting on 24 August 1993, the request was discussed by the Union's Executive. It was resolved not to establish a Provincial Problem Animal Control Committee.
- The Committee was wished well with its work.

On 28 September 1993[590] Mrs. M.E. Olckers (MEC: CPA) wrote to Mr. N.J. Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) and acknowledged receipt of the letter dated 14 September 1993 and noted the content regarding the 'Financing: National Problem Animal Policy Committee'. The matter was receiving attention and response would be forthcoming soon.

In a letter dated 29 September 1993[591] to Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC), Mr. J.C. Botha (Senior Operations Officer, The Free State Agricultural Union) referred to 'Provincial Problem Animal Committee' and wrote:

- The Free State RPO discussed this matter at their recent meeting.
- The functions and necessity of such a committee were not clear. Funding for such a committee was also problematic.
- Although a problem animal policy committee was not formally established, the matter was receiving attention.

Version 5.0 - Hoede Waar - Version 5.0

[587] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.
[588] Editor's Note: letter Ref. ANR 7/9/5 dated 26 May 1993.
[589] File L.7/1/4 Eastern Cape Agricultural Union, Queenstown.
[590] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.
[591] File 9-21-209 The Free State Agricultural Union, Bloemfontein.

In a faxed letter dated 1 October 1993[592] to Mr. N.J. Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC), Mr. J.S. Botha (for General Manager: Western Cape Agricultural Union, Paarl) wrote regarding 'Establishing: Provincial Problem Animal Control Committees':

- Reference was made to the letter dated 8 July 1993 (Ref WK40) with annexures.
- The letter and annexures were forwarded to the Union's RPO Executive for comments. Their comments have been received, namely:
  - the national policy and strategy were accepted in principle;
  - the establishment of a provincial committee to liaise between role players were, because of financial consideration, not considered at that stage; and
  - the letter and annexures were forwarded to affiliations (farmers' associations and farmers' unions) it was requested if the matter of problem animals warranted it, liaison could be initiated at the regional level.
- Furthermore, the Western Cape Agricultural Union's RPO requested:
  i. a definition was provided for 'vagrant' dogs;
  ii. full detail be provided for all rights, obligations, duties and responsibilities of landowners in cases when vagrant dogs were found on their property; and
  iii. particulars be provided of situations where vagrant dogs could be destroyed without any fear of prosecution.

In a letter dated 4 October 1993[593] to Mr. J. Human (Deputy General Manager: Transvaal Agricultural Union, Silverton), Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) referred to 'Establishing Provincial Problem Animal Control Committees' and wrote:

- At the Midyear Executive meeting of the Transvaal Branch NWGA, Mr. P.E. Kingwill, Chairperson of the National Policy Committee announced that circulars were send to all the Provincial Agricultural Unions requesting that the Union, in cooperation with the Provincial Nature Conservation Authorities and RSCs, launched an effort to establish Provincial Problem Animal Control Committees.
- It was inquired regarding any progress made in the matter.

In a letter dated 5 October 1993[594] to Mr. J.C. Botha (Senior Operations Officer, The Free State Agricultural Union), Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) referred to 'Provincial Problem Animal Control Committee' and wrote:

- Receipt of the letter dated 29 September 1993 (Ref. 9/21/209) was acknowledged.
- Enclosed was a copy of the National Policy Committee's strategic action plan, drafted on 18 November 1993. It set out the responsibilities of the Provincial Problem Animal Control Committees. Also included was a copy of the National Policy Document for Problem Animal Control in South Africa.
- For the funding of the Provincial Committee the respective role players may agree to fund the activities of such a committee in a fair manner. For more information, the matter could be discussed with Mr. André Pretorius, Chairperson of the Natal Problem Animal Control Committee. The Committee has been functioning successfully for the past three years [contact detail in Nottingham Road].

In a fax message dated 11 October 1993[595] to Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC), Mrs. Janita van Rooyen (for The Transvaal Agricultural Union, Silverton) referred to 'Establishing Provincial Problem Animal Control Committees' and wrote:

[592] File Western Cape Agricultural Union, Paarl.
[593] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.
[594] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.
[595] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.

Version 5.0 : HO de Waal - Version 5.0

- Reference was made to a telephone conversation earlier with his Secretary in his absence.
- The Transvaal RPO has not yet, since receiving the letter, met and would only meet on 2 November 1993. Only at that meeting, a decision could be taken regarding the establishment of a provincial problem animal control committee because all the affiliates must be involved with the decision to provide execution.
- With reference to attending the first National meeting, the meeting on 2 November should also first decide on involvement and must make a recommendation to the TAU Executive Committee because it involved considerable traveling expenses to Port Elizabeth. Therefore, a representative would not be send to the first meeting.

On 13 October 1993[596] Mr. Roy McBride (Rancher's Supply, Inc. The Livestock Protection Co., Alpine, Texas)[597] wrote to Mr. Peter Kingwill (NWGA, Port Elizabeth):

"*I want to express my appreciation to Woolex for their support and organization of livestock protection collar courses held in Natal and OFS in September, 1993. The meetings were superbly organized by John Fair, and he was ably assisted by Peter Joubert.*

I welcome the support of the wool industry's assistance in distributing technology that will enable the farmer to do a better job of controlling problem animals. As I view the difficulties that lie ahead for the wool industry worldwide, I believe it our objective to produce our product without adverse environmental consequences. Selectivity, efficacy, and meaningful advancement in the technology and application of control tools is something all of us can agree on. Our company is committed to working with the wool board, government and conservationists in achieving these goals.

In respect to this commitment, I spent ten days in the RSA visiting foundries and engineering companies to solicit bids for the African fabrication of modern control tools. We already manufacture in the U.S. a steel trap that has a truly effective spring-tension device that prevents the capture of a broad range of non-target animals. It is used by the U.S. Department of Agriculture in their animal damage control program. In addition to the trap, we are investigating the S.A. manufacture of our cyanide gun that is much safer than the coyote getter. Our company already has the dies, tools, and expertise to complete these tasks, and they are underway.

We are looking forward to continuing and improving our service to the wool industry with high quality tool made in South Africa. Please thank John Fair on our behalf for the support we received from Woolex.

Sincerely yours."

In a letter dated 14 October 1993[598] to Mrs. Janita van Rooyen (for The Transvaal Agricultural Union, Silverton), Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) referred to 'Establishing Provincial Problem Animal Control Committees' and wrote:

- Reference was made to the fax message dated 11 October 1993.
- It was noted with appreciation that the Transvaal RPO would convene on 2 November 1993 to discuss the possible establishment of a Problem Animal Control Committee for Transvaal.
- It was explained that participation in the National Policy Committee meetings was not necessarily a prerequisite for the establishment of a Problem Animal Control Committee. The purpose of the Committee would be to address problems at the local level. Continuous liaison through letters, circulars and other methods of liaison, could substitute direct participation at

[596] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.
[597] Editor's Note: Field Offices: Alpine, Texas; Bariloche, Argentina; Mariental, Namibia; Worcester, South Africa.
[598] File WK 40D, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.

Version 5.0 HO de Waal - Version 5.0

the National Committee, thus eliminating the foreseen problem of high traveling cost to National Policy Committee meetings.

- A Provincial Problem Animal Control Committee was functioning for the past several years in natal and succeeded to accommodate other role players such as the Natal Parks Board, the Provincial Administration as well as the producers' organisations on such a committee and addressed with great success aspects such as licencing of dogs, putting out poison, the use of poison collars, etc.
- For cognisance a copy of the Strategic Plan of the National Policy Committee was attached, which clearly showed what the role and function of the envisaged Provincial Committees should be.
- For any inquiries regarding the working of provincial Committees, they were invited to contact Mr. A.P. Pretorius, Chairperson of the Natal Problem Animal Control Committee in Nottingham Road [contact detail].
- Feedback would be appreciated.

In a letter dated 14 October 1993[599] to Mr. N.J. Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC), the Director: Association of RSCs of South Africa (Bloemfontein) wrote:

- Refer to the letters dated 22 June, 14 July and 14 September 1993 (WK 40).
- On 22 September, the Executive Board of the Association resolved: '*The Regional Services Councils/Combined Services Councils may decide on an individual basis to contribute.*'

In a letter dated 19 October 1993[600] to Mr. P.E. Kingwill (NPAPC, Port Elizabeth), Dr. P. Mulder (Chief Directorate: Nature and Environmental Conservation, Pretoria) referred to '' and wrote:

"*Two recent court cases involving primates have resulted in a public debate on our present policy regarding these animals. In view of this I have, in consultation with the various parties, decided that an in depth evaluation of the situation be undertaken by a broad spectrum of experts. Your valued expertise and experience would sincerely be appreciated, either by contributing at a workshop or comments on the problem as set out below:*

1. <u>Problem</u>

- There is at present an unacceptable flow of primates to zoological gardens, ARC and private individuals and the sources seem to be an illegal pet trade (not organized) or as a result of control measures or indiscriminate hunting.

- normally these animals are kept for varying periods and are eventually either released or offered to institutions like ARC or Zoo's for rehabilitation.

- both the vervet monkey and baboon cause extensive damage to crops and stock in rural areas and there are increasing reports of damage in towns and resorts where their aggressive nature is also a concern. In the latter case a contributing factor seems to be the feeding of animals and refuse dumps.

2. <u>Present policy and legal status</u>

- Due to the aggressive nature of these animals when they reach maturity, disease transmission and the fact that it is not ethical to keep wild animals in captivity as pets, no one is allowed to keep these animals for the above reason:

- animals voluntary handed over or forfeited by the courts are:

- *offered to zoological gardens (at present not possible due to numbers already kept)*
- *euthanised*
- *given to research institutions who abided by the National Code of Ethics as regard to laboratory animals*

[599] File V12/2/5/39 Association of Regional Services Councils of South Africa, Bloemfontein.

[600] File TN 8/4/4/2B Chief Directorate: Nature and Environmental Conservation, Transvaal Provincial Administration.

Version 5.0 - NO Draft - Version 5.0

- *offered to experts for rehabilitation and at present there is only one individual with limited capacity.*

From a conservation point of view these options are all unacceptable yet these are the realities which we have to handle almost every day.

Both baboons and vervet monkeys are classified as problem animals which in essence means that:

- they can be controlled on an organized basis by landowners (clubs) within a proclaimed area. At present there is not one such club.

- can be controlled (hunted) by a landowner who has damage or by a person who has his permission to do it on his behalf.

- these animals may not be kept, possessed, sold, bred, bought, donated, received as donation, imported conveyed or set free unless he is in possession of a permit.

3. Solutions

There are several options to handle this very sensitive issue and these are listed below:

3.1 Law enforcement

Strictly enforce the legislation pertaining to the keeping of primates (baboons of vervet monkeys) as pets. This is present policy yet in almost all cases the 'defence' is that it was saved by either having rescued it from somebody else or having bought it from a person for the same reason. At present in all these cases the persons are requested to voluntary hand over the animal or be charged.

3.2 Change the status

It has been suggested that the status of these animals as 'Problem animals' be changed to that of 'Ordinary Game'. The advantages are that a non-owner would have to have a permit (licence) to hunt these animals. The owner, however, would still be entitled to protect crops and livestock where these animals cause damage. As these animals are not nocturnal the so-called damage permit issued for antelope and for instance leopard, would not be applicable.

It would also mean that licences and licence fees be established for these animals although a blanket closed season could be proclaimed. Nature Conservators would, however, be put in a very difficult position when refusing permit applications where large numbers of the animals are present on a property and also cause damage.

3.3 Rehabilitation

Being aware of the intricate social structure of vervet monkey and baboon troops, most experts agree that successful rehabilitation is a virtually impossible undertaking. It is hoped that the project of Mrs. Miljo would shed light on this assumption.

4. Summary

The following are seen as key questions for discussion and policy formulation:

- What is the present status of the species in Transvaal;

- is there significant pet trade or indiscriminate killing of these animals by landowners and non-owners (verified statistics would be appreciated);

- should primates be kept as pets;

- is the present legislation allowing a landowner to protect his crops and property justifiable;

- what should be the fate of these animals.

Can the present situation be remedied by either one or a combination of the following:

- a change in legislation;

- an extensive educational and media campaign;

- strict law enforcement?

This is but a short introduction to the issue and please feel free to add any suggestions or alternatives. I would sincerely appreciate your comments and an indication whether you are willing to participate in a workshop by the end of November."

Version 5.0 - Ria de Waal - Version 5.0

On 25 October 1993[601] Mrs. M.E. Olckers (MEC: CPA) wrote to Mr. N.J. Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) and referred to the letter of 14 September 1993 (WK40) regarding the 'Financing: National Problem Animal Policy Committee':

- The CPA has taken quite some time ago a policy decision to discontinue from financing problem animal control and limit its role to extension, training and research and providing some equipment at a fee. In line with this decision, the activities of the NPAPC was wholeheartedly supported by the Cape Nature Conservation and Museums, for example making information available, drafting policy documents, formulating scientific input and providing input at the National Problem Animal Forum in May 1993. These contributions as well as the costs of attending the meetings of the Committee was borne in full by the Cape Nature Conservation and Museums. In addition, the Administration has also hosted a meeting of the Committee.
- Given this background as well as rendering continued support services to the farming community of the Cape Province, the Administration can unfortunately not provide the requested financial contribution. However, we would continue to participate as in the past in the activities of the Committee.

In a letter dated 4 November 1993[602] to Mr. N.J. Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC), Mr. Johan Lensing (Assistant Director: Nature and Environment Conservation, Cape Town) attached a translation of the "National Policy and Strategy for Problem Animal Control in South Africa" and wrote:

"*At the meeting of committee on 6 May 1993 it was resolved that after Greg Laws had translated the policy document he would forward it to me for controlling. It is important that the two versions convey the exact meaning.*

Therefore, I have used the copy of the document issued at the recent meeting and inserted editorial changes on the text. I am not trying to criticise the work of Greg (it is a good translation), but merely try to ensure that the translation is in line with the original to which all agreed. I am including my version of the document for you to handle at your discretion."

In a letter dated 8 November 1993[603] to Mr. P.E. Kingwill (Rietpoort, Murraysburg), Mr. N.J. Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) referred to 'Policy Formulation: Problem Animals Transvaal Nature Conservation' and wrote:

- Attached for information was a letter received from Dr. Mulder on behalf of the Chief Directorate: Nature and Environmental Conservation of Transvaal.
- In a telephonic conversation with Dr. Mulder, it was confirmed that it was not necessary for Mr. Kingwill to attend the Workshop at the end of November 1993.
- The Chairperson of the NPAPC was welcome to offer comments on the document. According to Dr. Mulder, the document focused on the 'status' of problem animals and possible amendments to legislation to restrict the trade in problem animals.
- It was inquired whether input should be provided on behalf of the Policy Committee on the matter. (Handwritten notes attached to the letter: 22-11-93: telephone from Mr. P. Kingwill – request that the matter be referred to the Transvaal Committee for attention; and 22-11-93: telephone to Mr. C. Greyling – he already knew about the letter and personally received a letter. He would also contact Dr. Mulder).

In a letter dated 10 November 1993[604] to Mr. G.D. Laws (Nature Conservation Scientist, Natal Parks Board), Mr. N.J. Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) referred to their telephone conversation on 9 November 1993. He include the copy of the policy Document received from Mr. Johan

[601] File ANO 7/138 Executive Committee, Province of the Cape of Good Hope.
[602] File ANO 7/138, Head Office, Cape Nature Conservation, Cape Provincial Administration, Cape Town.
[603] File WK 40A, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.
[604] File WK 40 (b), NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee, Strategiese Plan.

Version 5.0 – HO de Waal – Version 5.0

Lensing with the proposed editorial changes. As indicated in the telephone conversation Johan Lensing's original document was included for the two gentlemen to liaise to agree on the final document.

In a fax dated 16 November 1993[605] to Mr. N.J. Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC), Mrs. V. Hunt (Branch Manager: The Wildlife Society of Southern Africa, Port Elizabeth) said that Mr. J.D. van Wyk of the Head Office of Cape Nature Conservation advised her she could obtain an English version of the Problem Animal Control Policy from Mr. Vermaak. They have been endeavouring for some considerable time to obtain the document and was delighted to hear that it was at last available. (Handwritten note on the fax: In a telephone conversation Mrs. Hunt was informed that the English version of the document is in the process of being finalised and a copy would be available at about 28 February 1994).

In a fax message dated 17 November 1993[606] to Mrs. Janita van Rooyen (for The Transvaal Agricultural Union, Silverton), Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) referred to 'Establishing Provincial Problem Animal Control Committees' and wrote:

- Reference was made to the previous fax message dated 11 October 1993.
- It was noted that the Transvaal RPO intended to convene on 2 November 1993 to decide among other about the possibility of establishing a Provincial Problem Animal Control Committee.
- It was inquired about the outcome of the meeting on the matter.

In a letter dated 26 November 1993[607] to Mr. D.J. Cook (Natal Parks Board, Pietermaritzburg), Mr. N.J. Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) wrote regarding 'Retirement: 1994'):

"*On behalf of the Chairman and Committee, we would like to express our sincere appreciation for your valuable inputs over the past years.*

We hope that 1994 would be a prosperous year for you and your family and that you will enjoy every moment of your new status!"

In a fax dated 26 November 1993[608] to Mr. Jan van der Walt (Editor: Red Meat), Mr. N.J. Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) provided the following list of contact details:

- Mr. J.E. Lensing, Deputy Director: Nature and Environment Conservation, CPA, Cape Town.
- Dr. L.P. Stoltz, Director: Nature and Environment Conservation, PAO, Bloemfontein.
- Mr. N. Ferreira, First Nature Conservation Specialist, PAO, Bloemfontein.
- Mr. S.W. Wolff, Deputy Director, TPA, Nelspruit.
- Mr. P.J.J van Rensburg, Nature Conservation Specialist, TPA, Karenpark.
- Mr. D.J. Cook, Deputy Director, Western Region, Natal Parks Board, Pietermaritzburg.
- Mr. G.D. Laws, Nature Conservation Specialist, Natal Parks Board, Estcourt.
- Mr. C.L. Greyling, Chairperson: Federal Problem Animal Control Association, Wakkerstroom.
- Mr. M van der Merwe, Federal Problem Animal Control Association, Chrissiemeer.

In a letter dated 29 November 1993[609] to Mr. N.J. Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC), Mr. G.D. Laws (Conservator Northern Zones, Natal Parks Board) wrote regarding the tranalation of the National Policy:

[605] File ANO /9/1 The Wildlife Society of Southern Africa, Port Elizabeth.
[606] File WK 40D, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.
[607] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.
[608] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.
[609] File WK 40 (b), NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee, Strategiese Plan.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

"*I have perused the changes suggested by Mr. Lensing to the above document. Most of these changes appear to be of a grammatical nature and no shifts in policy approach were found. Unfortunately I was unable to decipher some of the suggestions and attach, therefore, a disk with the original version for editing.*"

In a letter dated 29 November 1993[610] to the President: NWGA of the OFS, Mr. Mr. F.J. du Toit of Smithfield referred to 'Breeding of hunt hounds by the Dept. Nature Conservation for problem animal control in the OFS' and wrote:

- The Ordinance on Problem Animals stated: '*The farmer in cooperation with Nature Conservation is responsible for controlling problem animals. The function of Nature Conservation in controlling problem animals is to provide the equipment such as trap cages, poison ejectors and hunt hounds to control problem animal*'.
- The hunt hounds were bred by Nature Conservation at the Bathurst breeding station from top breeding stock, which was selected from the hounds of Oranjejag. The breeding stock was indispensable and an expert on the subject, namely Mr. R. Wilke, conducted the breeding. Nature Conservation must be prevented from stop the breeding of hunt hounds at Bathurst station. When Nature Conservation wanted to sell or otherwise get rid of the breeding stock, the quality of breeders in the future would be lost because the hounds would be dispersed over South Africa.
- Professional hunters must obtain a hunt permit from nature conservation before he may hunt problem animals on the farms of other farmers. Nature Conservation also controlled the hunts by visiting the Hunters monthly to determine if the Hunters were competent to eliminate problem animals. Nature Conservation cannot just shift their responsibility onto farmers and then still wanted to exert control over problem animals.
- It was a very delicate matter for the small livestock farmers because they could not farm in the Free State without controlling problem animals. The populations of black-back jackals and caracal were escalating at such a rate that any slacking of problem animal control would have disastrous consequences for the small livestock industry.
- They called on the NWGA to investigate the matter urgently in cooperation with the NPAPC in the interest of small livestock farmers in the Free State.

In a letter dated 29 November 1993[611] to Dr. P. Mulder (Chief Directorate: Nature and Environmental Conservation, Pretoria) and copied to Mr. C.L. Greyling (Chairperson: Transvaal Federal Problem Animal Control Association), Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) referred to 'Problem Animal Policy: Transvaal Nature Conservation' and wrote:

- Reference was made to the letter dated 19 October 1993, Ref. TN 8/4/4/2B.
- As discussed by telephone, Mr. P.E. Kingwill on behalf of the National Policy Committee held the view that the Policy Determination for Problem Animal Control in Transvaal was a matter was which the relevant role players in Transvaal should determine.
- However, the National Policy Committee would appreciate it if the final product of the envisaged policy for Problem Animal Control could be provided to the National Policy Committee for cognisance.
- A copy of the letter as well as the recommendation by the Chairperson Mr. Kingwill was referred to the Chairperson of the Federal Problem Animal Control Association and was Mr. C.L. Greyling asked to provide input on behalf of the Transvaal Federal Problem Animal Control Association.

[610] File WK 2.2; WK 40D, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.
[611] File WK 40A, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.

Versie 5.0 - Hoofweg - Version 5.0

In a letter dated 2 December 1993[612] to Mr. Johan Strydom (Warden), Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) referred to 'Founding: Association of Problem Animal Hunters in the OFS' and wrote:

- Reference was made to their conversation by telephone on 9 November 1993.
- It would be appreciated if the representation on the possible founding of a Problem Animal Hunters Association in the OFS could be submitted. The Policy Committee would provide all support to get such committee off the ground.
- Consideration may even be given to establish a Provincial Problem Animal Control Association for the Free State, comprising representatives of the Directorate: Nature Conservation, the RSCs, the NWGA, RPO and the envisaged and to be established Hunters Association. Through such a Provincial Committee, local problems at ground level could be addressed and serve as a discussion forum between the producer, hunter and provincial authority.

In a letter dated 6 December 1993[613] to Mr. J.S. Bothma (RPO Western Cape, Western Cape Agricultural Union, Paarl), Mr. N.J. Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) referred to a previous letter dated 1 October 1993 regarding 'Inquiries: Rights and obligations: vagrant dogs' and wrote:

- The inquiries were forwarded to Mr. J.E. Lensing, Deputy Director: Nature and Environment Conservation of the CPA. Feedback will be provided as soon as it was received.
- At the recent meeting of the NPAPC, it was decided to publish the inquiry in an article in the Agricultural Media, Golden Fleece and Red Meat to address the problems vagrant dogs hold for communities. He would be kept informed.

In letters dated 6 December 1993[614] to Dr. C.F. Slabber (Director General: Department of National Health and Population Development, Pretoria), Dr. W.R. Hoods (MEC: TPA, Pretoria), Mrs. M.E. Olckers (MEC: CPA, Cape Town), Mr. P.J.S. Olivier (MEC: PAO, Bloemfontein) and Mr. R.E. Redinger (MEC: NPA, Pietermaritzburg), Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) referred to 'Vagrant dogs: Endangering people and animals' and wrote:

- National Policy Committee
- The National Policy Committee functioned as a liaising and coordinating forum by integrating the expertise of the Authorities and stakeholders in Agriculture to effectively reduce the losses caused by problem animal animals with the aid of ecologically and ethically acceptable methods.

The Committee comprised representatives of the small livestock producers' associations, the National Wool Growers' Association of South Africa, the Red Meat Producers' Organisation, the South African Agricultural Union, the Association of RSCs, the Members of the Executive Committees tasked with Nature Conservation in Provinces, the four Provincial Nature Conservation Authorities, the Natal Parks Board and the Federal Problem Animal Control Association.

- The National Policy Committee met every six months and endeavoured to launch actions to resolve problems regarding effective problem animal control at the policy and local levels.
- Vagrant dogs
- At the National Policy Committee meeting on 26 October 1993, there was unanimity that vagrant dogs were increasingly endangering people and animals.
- The following aspects were noted:
  - Small Livestock Industry: Representatives of the RPO and NWGA said that it became impossible to farm with small livestock in some areas. In areas in the Eastern Transvaal,

[612] File WK 40D, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.
[613] File WK 40D, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.
[614] File WK 40D, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.

Version 1.60 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

Northern Natal and the Eastern Cape, as well as farms adjacent to black townships, almost all farming with small livestock have ceased because of the large number of uncontrolled vagrant dogs. This trend impact negatively on the areas where such problems existed, because farms adjacent to buffers ones next to black townships and nearby states, were also experiencing incidents of mauling by vagrant dogs.

- Human health: The representative of the NPA informed the Policy Committee that a high incidence of rabies was experienced that year in Natal. This phenomenon was ascribed to the large number of uncontrolled vagrant dogs. The problem reached such a level that the NPA were going to launch a project in 1994 to inform all sections of the population about the dangers and also try to implement effective control methods.
- Wildlife: Representatives of the respective Provincial Nature Conservation Authorities were unanimous that the large number of vagrant dogs were increasingly endangering the small wildlife population of South Africa. Uncontrolled hunting, as well as the large concentration of vagrant dogs in certain areas, exacerbated the problem.

- Effective control
- In view of the above, the Policy Committee unanimously resolved to request the Minister of National Health and Population Development, as well as the MEC's of the respective Provinces responsible for Nature Conservation, to implement measures for the effective control of vagrant dogs.
- Feedback in this regard was awaited.

In letters dated 7 December 1993[615] to Mr. Johan Lensing (Deputy Director: Nature and Environment Conservation, CPA), Dr. L.P. Stoltz (Director: Nature and Environment Conservation, PAO), Mr. N. Ferreira (First Nature Conservation Specialist, PAO) and Mr. P.J.J. (Petrus) van Rensburg (Nature Conservation Scientist, TPA, Karenpark), Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) referred to 'Norms for Accreditation of Problem Animal Hunters and Instructors' and wrote:

- At the recent meeting of the NPAPC on 26 October 1993 the following norms for problem animal hunters and instructions were unanimously accepted, namely:

a) For problem animal hunters

The successful completion of an approved (as determined by the local Directorate: Nature and Environment Conservation) training course in the control methods for which application was made for registration and which was presented by one of the Nature Conservation Authorities, an accredited instructor, a technicon or agricultural college.

1. Possessed certificates of competency for control methods for which it was legally required.
2. The completion of a period of practical problem animal control under supervision of an accredited problem animal hunter or a person who would qualify for accreditation as a problem animal hunter (*i.e.* an apprenticeship).
3. The completion of successful problem animal control operations or research in which some of the applicable control methods were used.
4. On application for registration, sign an undertaking to comply at all times with the code of practice of problem animal control.

b) For instructors

All the above plus:

1. Two years of applicable experience as problem animal hunter.
2. Submitting course content, which was acceptable for the committee.

- **NOTE**: Documents to support compliance of all the requirements must accompany the application for registration.
- The Policy Committee resolved that for accreditation as problem animal hunter and/or instructor with the National Policy Committee, candidates must comply with the norms as set

[615] File WK 40D, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.

Version 5.0 - Nico de Waal - Version 5.0

out, and that after sitting for a theoretical examination by a technicon and/or college, the relevant Provincial Authority must also be satisfied with a practical examination that the person was competent to act as problem animal hunter and/or instructor. Only after the Provincial Authority was satisfied such a candidate would be accredited with the Policy Committee.

Norms for establishing a uniform standard

- In view of the divergent needs of the different Provincial Authorities, the principle was adopted that a comprehensive single manual for the land was not feasible and it was proposed that the Committee should only adopt a framework to which the course content of each course or manual, presented by whoever, must comply.
- The proposed framework-curriculum, as submitted by the Transvaal Directorate: Nature and Environment Conservation, was accepted but with the condition that provision must also be made for safety and precautionary measures.
- When a need existed, the respective Provincial Authorities was requested to liaise individual and directly with agricultural colleges and/or technicons in each region where problem animal control courses were presented to finalise the content of the courses within the norms of the attached framework-curriculum as approved by the Committee.
- Where agricultural colleges (Grootfontein, Glen and Potchefstroom) have indicated that they would incorporate in the 1994 as part of the courses Problem Animal Control, the relevant Provincial Authorities were requested to assist these Colleges and would these courses as indicate be presented.
- The condition remained that only candidates who have successfully completed the academic/theoretical part of the proposed curriculum in a course, as well as successful completing the norms as detailed previously and required by the respective Provincial Authorities, would be accredited for the control methods in which they were trained.
- Appreciation was expressed towards all the Provincial Authorities who participated in establishing the norms for accreditation and the framework-curriculum as uniform standard.
- It was requested that mutual liaison should ensure the principle of safety and precautionary measures were incorporated as part of the framework-curriculum.

In letters dated 7 December 1993[616] to Mr. N. Ferreira (First Nature Conservation Specialist, PAO, Bloemfontein), Mr. G.D. Laws (Nature Conservation Scientist, Natal Parks Board, Estcourt), Mr. J.E. Lensing (Deputy Director: Nature and Environmental Conservation, CPA, Cape Town) and Mr. P.J.J. van Rensburg (Nature Conservation Scientist, TPA, Karenpark), Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) referred to 'Compiling: List Problem Animal Hunters and Instructors' and wrote:

- At its meeting on 26 October 1993 the National Policy Committee approved in principle that a uniform standard be established for accreditation of problem animal instructors and hunters. For accreditation with the Policy Committee, it was resolved that candidates must comply with the norms as set by the Policy Committee, as well as satisfying the relevant Provincial Authority by completing a practical examination to show competency to act as a problem animal hunter and/or instructor.
- Only after the Provincial Authority was satisfied, the candidate would be accredited with the policy Committee. To promote the possibility and advantages of being accredited with the Policy Committee, it was decided the Secretariat, in cooperation with the different Provincial Authorities, as well as Mr. John Fair (Wolex Extension Office, Harrismith), would compile a list of known problem animal hunters and/or instructors. At completion of the information, the Secretariat would contact the persons to inform them about the possibility and advantages of being accredited with the National Policy Committee.

[616] File WK 40D, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.

Version 5.0 - no de Wal - Version 5.0

- The Secretariat would appreciate it to receive a complete list of all known hunters and instructors of problem animal control and then compile a complete source list to contact the persons.
- If possible, the Secretariat would appreciate receiving the name lists by not later than 31 January 1994.

On 7 December 1993[617], Mr. N.J. Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) informed Mr. J.A. van Wyk (MP, Minister of Environmental Affairs and of Water Affairs), Dr. A.I. van Niekerk (MP, Minister of Agriculture) and Mr. J. Brazelle (MP, Chairman: Joint Committee for Environmental Affairs) about the establishment of the "*National Policy and Strategy for Problem Animal Control in South Africa*" (attached was an Afrikaans version of the "*Nasionale Beleid en Strategie: Probleemdierbeheer in Suid-Afrika*"):

1. **National Policy Committee**

The Problem Animal Policy Committee was formed in 1991 and function as a liaising and coordinating forum by integrating the expertise of the Authorities and stakeholders in Agriculture to effectively reduce the losses caused by problem animal animals with the aid of ecologically and ethically acceptable methods. To succeed in this goal the Committee developed specific strategies regarding policy formulation, communication, control, training, research and development

The following institutions and persons are represented on the Committee:

The National Wool Growers' Association of South Africa
The Red Meat Producers' Organisation
The South African Agricultural Union
The Federal Problem Animal Control Association of Transvaal
The Association of RSCs
The MEC tasked with Nature Conservation in Provinces
The four Provincial Nature Conservation Authorities.

2. Establishment: National Policy and Strategy for Problem Animal Control

A milestone was reached to establish a National Policy and Strategy for Problem Animal Control in South Africa with a consensus decision by the role players represented in the Policy Committee.

The Policy Document contained the input, comments, additions and corrections of all the role players named previously and was the product of an 18-month period of deliberations.

The goals for problem animal control at the policy level and the strategies to achieve it was described in the document. It is emphasised that the aim of the Policy Document was to ensure problem animal control in South Africa was achieved cost-effectively by eliminating losses in livestock flocks and not by the local eradication of species.

In a letter dated 9 December 1993[618] to Mr. Johan Lensing (Deputy Director: Nature and Environment Conservation), Mr. N.J. Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) attached a copy of a letter received from Greg Laws, as well as a data disk. The content is self-explanatory. Apparently, Mr. Laws could not decipher Mr. Lensing's handwriting.

In a letter dated 9 December 1993[619] to Mr. N.J. Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC), Mr. J.C.R. Hartman (General Manager: The Transvaal Agricultural Union, Silverton) referred to 'Provincial Problem Animal Committee' and wrote:

- The Transvaal RPO convened on 2 November 1993 and appreciation was expressed for the initiative to establish a National Problem Animal Committee.

[617] File WK 40 (b), NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee, Strategiese Plan.
[618] File WK 40 (b), NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee, Strategiese Plan.
[619] File K 23/1 The Transvaal Agricultural Union, Silverton.

Version 5.0 - HG de Waal - Version 5.0

- The meeting decided that such a committee could function as an *ad hoc* committee of the Transvaal Small Livestock Committee and the necessary external expertise would be invited to ensure meaningful discussions on matters and refer those that cannot be solved locally to the National Committee.
- Furthermore, a Problem Animal Association already existed in Transvaal and they would be involved.
- The first meeting was scheduled for 24 May 1884 but District Agricultural Unions would be contacted soon to identify problems and in reaction thereto, the meeting may convene earlier in 1994.
- A copy of the previous minutes was requested to use it as point of departure and explain the working of such a meeting as well as recent problems in their monthly newsletter.
- Assurance was given than a serious effort would be made to propagate the workings of the committee at a high level and any information from the Secretariat would be welcomed because of his own limited knowledge of the topic.

On 14 December 1993[620], Mr. G.S. Reid (Administrative Secretary for Dr. A.I. van Niekerk (Minister of Agriculture) acknowledged on behalf of the Minister Mr. N.J. Vermaak's (Secretary: NPAPC) letter (File WK 40B - 7 December 1993) and the annexure "*Nasionale Beleid en Strategie: Probleemdierbeheer in Suid-Afrika*". The Minister noted with appreciation the content of the Policy Document and conveyed appreciation for the valuable contribution made by this strategy towards problem animal control in South Africa.

In a letter dated 15 December 1993[621] to Mr. J.C.R. Hartman (General Manager: The Transvaal Agricultural Union, Silverton), Mr. N.J. Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) referred to 'Provincial Problem Animal Committee' and wrote:

- Reference was made to the letter dated 9 December 1993, Ref K 23/1.
- Appreciation was expressed on behalf of the Policy Committee for the positive attitude towards establishing a Provincial Problem Animal Control Committee.
- At its recent meeting the National Policy Committee recommended that the producers' organisations, the RPO as well as the Transvaal Branch of the NWGA, in cooperation with the Transvaal Federal Problem Animal Control Association, work together to establish a Provincial Problem Animal Control Committee. The Directorate: Nature and Environmental Conservation of Transvaal agreed to be involved at Provincial level in problem animal control matters, as well as presenting training courses in problem animal control at ground level.
- Mr. C.L. Greyling, Chairperson of the Transvaal Federal Problem Animal Control Association indicated that, if such a need existed, the organisation would cooperate and assist in getting such a committee of the ground.
- The contact detail of key persons were provided, should a convenor want to liaise when starting the process of establishing a Transvaal Provincial Committee.

  Federal Problem Animal Control Association - Mr. C.L. Greyling, Wakkerstroom.
  Red Meat Producers' Organisation - Mr. G. Schutte, Pretoria.
  NWGA of SA – Transvaal Branch - Mr. J.E. Pieterse, Machadodorp.
  Transvaal Nature and Environmental Conservation - Mr. P.J.J. van Rensburg, Karenpark and Mr. S.W. Wolff, Nelspruit.
- Included was also the Strategic Action Plan for executing the National Policy and Strategy for Problem Animal Control in South Africa, as compiled on 18 November 1992 by the NPAPC.
- With the Action Plan, the National Policy Committee endeavoured to implement the national policy in practical terms at ground level. The document showed the important role

[620] File 3/10/21 (41/94) Ministry of Agriculture.
[621] File File WK 40D, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.

Version 50 - Koaqwaar - Version 5.0

which Provincial Committees could play to address problems regarding control of problem animals at the local level.

- A Provincial Problem Animal Control Committee already existed in Natal, with representation by the NWGA, the RPO, the Natal Parks Board as well as the NPA. This Committee was effectively addressing problems regarding the control of problem animals.
- At the recent meeting of the Central Executive of the NWGA on 28 October 1993, the principle was adopted that producers' organisations, namely the NWGA and RPO be encouraged to make an effort to establish such committees in the service areas of the Agricultural Unions where such committees were not yet established (i.e. East, West and Northern Cape, as well as the Free State and Transvaal). Negotiations were in progress with role players in the Orange Free State and it is envisaged that a Provincial Committee for the Orange Free State would established early in 1994.
- He was wished a prosperous 1994.

On 18 December 1993[622], Mr. Arnold Nell (Administrative Secretary to Mr. J.A. van Wyk, MP, Minister of Environmental Affairs and of Water Affairs) acknowledged with appreciation on behalf of the Minister (Ref. P2/1) Mr. N.J. Vermaak's (Secretary: NPAPC) letter (File WK 40B - 7 December 1993) and the annexure "*Nasionale Beleid en Strategie: Probleemdierbeheer in Suid-Afrika*".

In a letter dated 20 December 1993[623] to Mr. N.J. Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC), the office of the Director General acknowledge on his behalf receipt of the letter regarding 'Vagrant dogs: Endangering people and animals' dated 6 December 1993 (File WKD). An answer would be forthcoming soon.

1994

In a letter dated 10 January 1994[624] to Mr. N.J. Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC), Dr. C.F. Slabber (Director General: Department of National Health and Population Development, Pretoria) referred to the letter 'Vagrant dogs: Endangering people and animals' dated 6 December 1993 (File WKD) and provided the following information:

- The Department understood the problems that could create by vagrant dogs but could only act when the health of people was endangered. Several diseases may be transmitted from dogs to humans. These diseases should not be a threat for humans if their owners ensure that they were appropriately vaccinated against the specific animal diseases, are dewormed regularly and control the external parasites on the animals. Rabies is the most dangerous disease that dogs may transmit to humans.
- According to information provided by the World Health Organisation's 'Expert Committee on Rabies', there was no evidence that the removal of vagrant dogs ever had a significant effect on the dog populations and the spreading of rabies. To the contrary, it was found that when up to 15% of a dog population was exterminated, the reproduction rate of the dog populations increased.
- Dr. R. Swanepoel, Department of National Health and Population Development is an expert on rabies and was working at the Institute of Virology. He has written a chapter on rabies for a textbook on animal diseases and specifically discussed the thinning out of dog populations. A copy of the relevant pages highlighting the control of rabies and specifically dog

[622] File P/2 Ministry of Environment Affairs and Water Affairs, Pretoria.
[623] File 273 Director General: Department of National Health and Population Development, Pretoria.
[624] File 10/2/1/5 Director General: Department of National Health and Population Development, Pretoria (enquiries Miss. D. Lombaard).

Version 5.0 - Nicole Wahl - version 5.0

populations, were attached[625]. Contact details were provided if more information was required from Dr. R. Swanepoel.

- The Department of Agriculture was responsible to control rabies in animals. In areas where rabies occurred regular vaccination campaigns were launched by the Department of Agriculture in cooperation with local authorities and the NSPCA. The security situation in Natal recently hampered the control of rabies because dogs could not be reached in some areas. About 1 million dogs were vaccinated annually by the Department of Agriculture. Only in areas where large uncontrolled outbreaks of rabies occurred, would it be considered to kill dogs that cannot be reached for vaccination. Contact details were provided for Dr. Brückner, Directorate Animal Health, for more information regarding the rabies control programme of the Department of Agriculture.
- The communities where vagrant dogs were present should be involved to solve the problem in cooperation with the relevant local authority to ensure efforts in this regard were sustained.
- Although his Department could not assist with solving the problem of vagrant dogs, it was hoped the information provided would be of value.

In a letter dated 11 January 1994[626] to Dr. L.P. Stoltz (Director: Nature and Environment Conservation, PAO, Bloemfontein), Mr. N.J. Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) referred to 'Breeding of hunt hounds by Department Nature Conservation for problem animal control in the OFS' and wrote:

- Attached was a copy of a letter received from Mr. F.J. du Toit of Smithfield[627]. The content was self-explanatory.
- Feedback on the matter would be appreciated before Friday 11 February 1994; the Secretariat would forward the response to Mr. F.J. du Toit.

In a letter dated 11 January 1994[628] to Mr. F.J. du Toit (Smithfield), Mr. N.J. Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) referred to 'Breeding of hunt hounds by Department Nature Conservation for problem animal control in the OFS' and wrote:

- Reference was made to the letter dated 29 November 1993.
- Mr. J.A. Neethling, President: NWGA Free State gave the original letter to the NPAPC Secretariat on 8 December 1993.
- The content of the letter was noted and was forwarded for comments to the PAO. The NPAPC would also discuss it at the forthcoming meeting on 22 March 1994.
- He would be kept abreast on any feedback.

In a letter dated 11 January 1994[629] to Mr. N.J. Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC), Mrs. M.E. Olckers (MEC: CPA, Cape Town) wrote regarding 'Vagrant dogs':

- The letter of 6 December 1993 was acknowledged and commended it as reflection of the positive attitude of the NPAPC towards its activities.
- It was stated that in the Cape Province the licencing and control of vagrant dogs were the function of the respective local authorities, including the RSCs. The role of the Cape Nature Conservation and Museums was limited to providing certain control equipment, the training of problem animal hunters and landowners and rendering services regarding the control of

[625] Swanepoel, R., 1993. Rabies. In: Infectious diseases of livestock with special reference to southern Africa. (eds.) Coetzer, J.A.W., Thomson, G.R., Tustin, R.C. and Kriek, N.P.J. Cape Town. Oxford University Press Southern Africa (in press).
[626] File WK 2.2; WK 40D, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.
[627] Editor's Note: refer to letter dated 29 November 1993.
[628] File WK 2.2; WK 40D, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.
[629] File ANO 7/138, Executive Committee, Cape Provincial Administration, Cape Town.

Version 5.0 - Hobe de Waal - Version 5.0

vagrant dogs. Any effort to curb the increasing threat by vagrant dogs, which was fully supported, must be tackled with the cooperation of the local authorities.

- Therefore, the liberty was taken to forward the letter to a colleague, Mr. P.J. Schoeman, MEC responsible for Local Authority management for consideration. A response could be expected soon.

In a letter dated 12 January 1994[630], the Director General: Agriculture informed Mr. N.J. Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) that a copy of his letter (File WK 40B of 7 December 1993) and the annexure, was forwarded to the Department and the content was noted with appreciation. Continuation with the task was commended.

In a letter dated 19 January 1994[631] to Mrs. M.E. Olckers (MEC: CPA, Cape Town), Mr. N.J. Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) referred to 'Vagrant dogs':

- The letter of 11 January 1994 (Ref. ANO 7/138) was acknowledged.
- The content of the letter was noted and feedback on the matter from Mr. P.J. Schoeman, MEC responsible for Local Authority would be awaited.

On 19 January 1994[632],[633] Mr. G.M. Schutte (Manager: RPO) wrote to Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC):

- Attached was the 2nd payment for the Secretarial Services of the NPAPC, as arranged previously in a letter dated 5 July 1993.
- It was trusted that was in order.

In a letter dated 19 January 1994[634] to Dr. C.F. Slabber (Director General: Department of National Health and Population Development, Pretoria), Mr. N.J. Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) acknowledged receipt of the letter dated 10 January 1994 (File 10/2/1/5) regarding 'Vagrant dogs: Endangering people and animals.' The content was noted with appreciation and would be referred to the forthcoming meeting of the NPAC.

In a letter dated 11 February 1994[635] to Mr. N.J. Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC), Mr. N.A. Ferreira (Directorate Nature and Environment Conservation) wrote:

1. Reference was made to the letter dated 11 January 1994 (Ref. WK 2.2; WK 40D).
2. The Provincial Administration was trying to privatise the breeding of jackal hounds as soon as possible.
3. A core breeding stock was going to be retained to prevent loss of the bloodline.
4. According to policy, the Provincial Administration deemed it as its responsibility to assist the NPAPC with the acquisitioning and distribution of problem animal control appliances, which was not readily available in the general public trade.

In a letter dated 14 February 1994[636] to Mr. N.J. Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC), Mr. Johan Lensing (for Chief Director: Cape Nature Conservation and Museums) referred to 'List of Problem Animal Hunters and Instructors' and wrote:

- Reference was made to the letter of 7 December 1993.

Version 5.0 - NO de Waal - Version 5.0

[630] File 54/2A Department of Agriculture, Pretoria [Inquiries Mrs. L. Strydom].
[631] File WK 40D, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.
[632] File 14/1/8 Red Meat Producers' Organisation, Pretoria.
[633] Editor's Note: erroneously given as 'January 1993' instead of 'January 1994'.
[634] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.
[635] File N10/1/81 Directorate: Nature & Environmental Conservation, Orange Free State Provincial Administration.
[636] File ANO 9/18 Cape Nature Conservation and Museums, Cape Provincial Administration, Cape Town.

- Attached was a list of instructors and hunters known to the Cape Nature Conservation and Museums. The names of nature conservator employed by the Department and who may qualify for accreditation were included on the list. He was invited to contact them personally.

Accreditation of Problem Animal Hunters and Instructors by the National Problem Animal Policy Committee

List of operators/service providers from the records of the Cape Nature Conservation and Museums (CNCM) [Regional Services Council - RSC]

A. Hunters employed by hunt clubs and private hunters

	Name	Address	Institution	Region
1	C. van Niekerk	Springbok	RSC	WC
2	J. Burger	Springbok	RSC	WC
3	K. Alexander	Ebenaezer	Private	WC
4	A. Owies	Bitterfontein	Private	WC
5	I. Nieuwoudt	Clanwilliam		WC
6	B. Lubbe	Clanwilliam		WC
7	J. Tities	Vanrhynsdorp		WC
8	S.J.J. Hanekom	Aurora	West Coast RSC	WC
9	A. Nel	Sutherland	Private	WC
10	C. Prinse	Prince Albert Hamlet	Breërivier RSC	WC
11	H. Brink		Breërivier RSC	WC
12	K. Steenberg		Breërivier RSC	WC
13	W. Kaptein		Breërivier RSC	WC
14	C.J. Oosthuizen	Stilbaai	Stilbaai Farmers Union	WC
15	S. Oosthuizen	Stilbaai	Stilbaai Farmers Union	WC
16	R. Cronje	Stilbaai	Stilbaai Farmers Union	WC
17	J.W.S. Helm	Albertinia	Albertinia Farmers Union	WC
18	Mr. Radloff	Humansdorp	Suurbron Hunt Club	EC
19	Mr. van Reenen	Kareedouw	Kraga Hunt Club	EC
20	P. Bloem	Humansdorp	Elanda Hunt Club	EC
21	W. du Plessis	Humansdorp		EC
22	V. Pringle	Bedford	Baviaansrivier Hunt Club	EC
23	S Qinela	Grahamstown	Highlands Hunt Club	EC
24	L.E. Wicks	Grahamstown	Komitees Hunt Club	EC
25	V. Boni	Grahamstown	Southwell Vermin	EC
26	F.B. Norton	Grahamstown	Carlile Hunt Club	EC
27	Ceaser	The Secretary Cradock	Cradock Hunt Club	EC
28	Joseph	The Secretary Cradock	Cradock Hunt Club	EC
29	Willem	The Secretary Cradock	Cradock Hunt Club	EC
30	Wilson	The Secretary Cradock	Cradock Hunt Club	EC
31	John	The Secretary Cradock	Cradock Hunt Club	EC
32	F.R. Cockin	East London	Haga Haga Hunt Club	EC
33	P. Kruger	Stutterheim	Döhne Hunt Club	EC
34	S.D. Naudé	Barkley East	Bell River Hunt Club	EC
35	A.J. Robb	Stutterheim	Lugilo Hunt Club	EC
36	S.S. Sephton	Stutterheim	Wartrail Hunt Club	EC
37	B. Vorster	Ugie	Umga Hunt Club	EC
38	J.G. Jordaan	Maclear	Elanos Heights club	EC
39	I. Brummer	Elliot	Klowe Hunt Club	EC
40	S.H. Wentzel	Maclear	Wizardvale Hunt Club	EC
41	S. Steenekamp	Barley East	Bokspruit Hunt Club	EC
42	M. Orpen	Barley East	New England Hunt Club	EC
43	J. Cloete	Maclear	Tsitsa Hunt Club	EC
44	Mr. van der Vywer	Cathcart	Upper Cathcart Hunt Club	EC
45	Q. Roger	Stutterheim	Quanti Hunt Club	EC

Version 5.0 – Code Wars Version 5.0

46	M. Price	Queenstown	Swartiley Hunt Club	EC
47	S. Kemp	Cathcart	Coverside Hunt Club	EC
48	J. Kemp	Tylden	Buccleugh Hunt Club	EC
49	J. Potter	Cathcart	Henderson Hunt Club	EC
50	W. Williams	Griekwastad	CNCM	NC
51	P.R. Fleischack	Kimberley	CNCM	NC

B. Private Instructors

	Name	Address	Institution	Region
1	P. Schneekluth	Prince Albert	Private	WC

C. Nature Conservators with knowledge of problem animal control

	Name	Address	Institution	Region
1	L.H. Steyn	Voëlklip	CNCM	WC
2	A. Swart	George	CNCM	WC
3	J. Hartnick	Oudtshoorn	CNCM	WC
4	H.W. Heard	Bellville	CNCM	WC
5	G. Ferreira	Humansdorp	CNCM	EC
6	M. Basson	Port Elizabeth	CNCM	EC
7	M. Eksteen	Port Elizabeth	CNCM	EC
8	K. Miller	Port Elizabeth	CNCM	EC
9	M. Reynolds	Grahamstown	CNCM	EC
10	S. Manyakayaka	Grahamstown	CNCM	EC
11	D. Howell	East London	CNCM	EC
12	S. Bobytyana	East London	CNCM	EC
13	Div de Villiers	East London	CNCM	EC
14	J. Oelofse	Venterstad	CNCM	EC
15	R. Smit	Joubertina	CNCM	EC
16	P. Elliot	Joubertina	CNCM	EC
17	R. Stegman	Cambridge	CNCM	EC
18	P.S. Gelderhuys	Stellenbosch	CNCM	WC
19	Mike Linger	Upington	CNCM	NC
20	Cedric Newton	Upington	CNCM	NC
21	Nico Laubscher	Upington	CNCM	NC
22	R. Jessnitz	Postmasburg	CNCM	NC
23	N. Esterhuizen	Kimberley	CNCM	NC
24	S Rasmussen	Kimberley	CNCM	NC
25	Johan Jonk	Kimberley	CNCM	NC
26	Grahame Munro	Vanderkloof	CNCM	NC
27	Dewald Badenhorst	Colesberg	CNCM	NC
28	Pierre Weinberg	Vryburg	CNCM	NC
29	Gerrit Matthys	Vryburg	CNCM	NC
30	Peter Leitner	Vorstershoop	CNCM	NC

In a letter dated 14 February 1994[637] to Mr. N.J. Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC), Mr. Johan Lensing (Deputy Director: Nature and Environment Conservation) referred to Mr. Vermaak's letter of 8 December 1993 and wrote:

- Attached were excerpts from two ordinances[638] that spelled out the rights and obligations of landowners regarding vagrant dogs. It should be noted that the legislation only applied to the Cape Province.

[637] File ANO 7/138 Cape Nature Conservation and Museums, Cape Provincial Administration, Cape Town.
[638] Editor's Note: Ordinance on Problem Animal Control, No. 26 of 1957; Ordinance on Dog Taxes, No. 19 of 1978.

Version 5.0 - Van Dyk de Waal - Version 5.0

In a letter dated 17 February 1994[639] to Mr. N.J. Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC), Mr. Johan Lensing (Deputy Director: Nature and Environment Conservation) referred to Mr. Vermaak's letter of 9 December 1993 (File WK40D) and wrote:

"*I got the impression that no real serious effort was made to finalise the document. Therefore, I have done it myself and includes the improved copy. It is now more in line with the Afrikaans version and we may proceed with its distribution and publication*."

On 17 February 1994, in anticipation of the new geopolitical dispensation in South Africa from 28 April 1994, the NPAPC issued its English version of the National Policy and Strategy for Problem Animal Control in South Africa[640].

In a letter dated 1 March 1994[641] to Mr. F.J. du Toit (Smithfield), Mr. N.J. Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) referred to 'Breeding of hunt hounds by Department Nature Conservation for problem animal control in the OFS' and wrote:

- Reference was made to the previous letter dated 11 January 1994.
- Included was a letter that was received from the PAO.
- The letter would also serve at the forthcoming meeting of the NPAPC scheduled for 23 March 1994
- He would be kept informed on progress.

In a letter dated 1 March 1994[642] to Mr. Johan Strydom (Warden), Mr. N.J. Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) referred to 'Founding: Association of Problem Animal Hunters in the OFS' and wrote:

- Reference was made to their conversation by telephone on 9 November 1993, as well as the letter of 2 December 1993.
- The information as discussed would be appreciated.

In letters dated 1 March 1994[643] to Mr. Johan Lensing (Deputy Director: Nature and Environment Conservation, CPA), Dr. L.P Stoltz (Director: Nature and Environment Conservation, PAO), Mr. N. Ferreira (First Nature Conservation Specialist, PAO) and Mr. P.J.J. van Rensburg (Nature Conservation Scientist, TPA, Karenpark), Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) referred to 'Norms for Accreditation of Problem Animal Hunters and Instructors' and wrote:

- Reference was made to the previous letter of 7 December 1993 (Ref. WK 40D).
- Response regarding the above was awaited as soon as possible.

In letters dated 1 March 1994[644] to Mr. G.D. Laws (Nature Conservation Scientist, Natal Parks Board, Howick) and Mr. P.J.J. (Petrus) van Rensburg (Nature Conservation Scientist, TPA, Karenpark), Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) referred to 'Compiling: List Problem Animal Hunters and Instructors' and wrote:

- Reference was made to the previous letter dated 7 December 1993. (In letter to Mr. Laws: A copy of the previous letter was attached in case it was nor received because of change of address).

Version 5.0 - VC de Waal - Version 5.0

[639] File WK 40 (b), NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee, Strategiese Plan.
[640] National Problem Animal Policy Committee, 17 February 1994. National Policy and Strategy for Problem Animal Control in South Africa.
[641] File WK 2.2; WK 40D, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.
[642] File WK 40D, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.
[643] File WK 40D, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.
[644] File WK 40D, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.

- The Secretariat would appreciate receiving a complete list of all known hunters and instructors of problem animals to compile a complete source list and to contact the relevant persons.

In a letter dated 2 March 1994[645] to Mr. J.S. Bothma (RPO Western Cape, Western Cape Agricultural Union, Paarl), Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) responded to 'Inquiries: Rights and obligations: vagrant dogs' and wrote:

- Reference was made to a previous letter dated 1 October 1993, as well as the letter dated 6 December 1993 (Ref. WK 40D).
- Feedback was received from the Division: Cape Nature Conservation and Museums, CPA. The information as received was attached.

In a letter dated 2 March 1994[646] to Mr. J. Fair (Harrismith), Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) responded to 'Inquiries: Rights and obligations: vagrant dogs' and wrote:

- At the recent meeting of the NPAPC, a letter from the Western Cape RPO served. Inquiries were made about the rights and obligations of landowners regarding vagrant dogs found on their farms. This matter was referred by the NPAPC to Mr. J.E. Lensing with the request to provide detailed clarity on the rights and obligations of landowners regarding vagrant dogs. It was also requested that as soon as the information was available, the Secretariat must forward it to Mr. Fair as possible topic for an article on vagrant dogs in the Agricultural Media.
- A copy of the letter received from Mr. J.E. Lensing was attached, as well as the excerpts from relevant Legislation about the rights and obligations of landowners regarding vagrant dogs. Mr. Lensing said it should be noted the cited Legislation was only applicable in the Cape Province.

On 2 March 1994[647] the Director General: Agriculture responded to the letter (File WK 40B, dated 7 December 1993) and informed Mr. N.J. Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) that the letter, which was addressed to the Minister van Niekerk, was already made available to the Department of Agriculture. The Policy Document was regarded as very important. The Department accepted the guidelines and procedures regarding problem animal control as detailed in the document. The Policy Document was reproduced and made available to the Department's Agricultural Development Institutes where problem animal control was important.

On 2 March 1994[648] Mr. N.J. Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) referred Mrs. V. Hunt (Branch Manager: The Wildlife Society of Southern Africa, Port Elizabeth) to their telephone conversation during November 1993 and provided a copy of the National Policy and Strategy for Problem Animal Control in South Africa.

In a letter dated 2 March 1994[649] to Mrs. Marcelle Meredith (Executive Director: SPCA National Council of Southern Africa), Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) referred to her letter dated 15 February 1993 and attached a copy of the National Policy and Strategy for Problem Animal Control in South Africa.

Version 5.0 - Nico de Waal - Version 5.0

[645] File WK 40D, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.
[646] File WK 40D, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.
[647] File N10/1/81 Directorate: Nature & Environmental Conservation, Orange Free State Provincial Administration.
[648] File WK 40 (b), NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee, Strategiese Plan.
[649] File WK 40 (b), NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee, Strategiese Plan.

In a letter dated 18 March 1994[650] to the Chairman: NPAPC (attention Mr. N.J. Vermaak), Mr. P.J.J. van Rensburg (Chief Directorate: Nature and Environmental Conservation, TPA, Pretoria) referred to 'Norms for Accreditation of Problem Animal Hunters and Instructors' (Ref. WK 40D dated 1 March 1994) and wrote:

- As requested, it would be mutually arranged to incorporate safety and precautionary measures in the relevant curriculum. These measures were already seen as part of the curriculum's general guidelines and procedures for control devices.

In a letter dated 18 March 1994[651] to the Chairman: NPAPC (attention Mr. N.J. Vermaak), Mr. P.J.J. van Rensburg (Chief Directorate: Nature and Environmental Conservation, TPA, Pretoria) referred to 'Compiling: List Problem Animal Hunters and Instructors' (Ref. WK 40D dated 1 March 1994) and wrote:

- Attached was a list of problem animal hunters and instructors as requested.

	Instructors	**Address**
1	M.J. de Wet	Chief Directorate: Nature and Environmental Conservation, Pretoria
2	A.J. van der B de Villiers	
3	B.J. Curlewis	
4	H. Kleynhans	
5	M. van der Merwe	Transvaal Federal Problem Animal Control Association, Chrissiemeer
	Nature Conservators that completed the course	
1	S.D. West	Chief Directorate: Nature and Environmental Conservation, Pretoria
2	J.L. Pretorius	
3	D. Koen	
4	M.R. Hougaard	
5	H.J. van Schalkwyk	
6	T. Venter	
7	W. de Lange	
8	J. Fourie	
9	S.S.M. Rogers	
10	J.P. de Meyer	
11	R. Haywood	
12	J.J. Myburgh	
13	J.L. Snyman	
14	L. de Jager	
15	F. Pieterse	
16	R. de Jager	
17	A. van Wetten	
18	V.I. Prinsloo	
19	L. Nell	
20	W. Muller	
21	F.N. Krige	
22	M. Cohen	
23	S.P. Naude	
24	D.B. Curle	
25	D.W. Boshoff	
26	J.H.J. van Vuuren	
	Private Hunters	
1	C. Ankiewicz (hounds)	Silverton

[650] File TN 1/11/4/65 Chief Directorate: Nature and Environmental Conservation, Transvaal Provincial Administration, Pretoria.
[651] File TN 1/11/4/65 Chief Directorate: Nature and Environmental Conservation, Transvaal Provincial Administration, Pretoria.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

In a letter dated 10 August 1993[652] to Mr. N.J. Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC), Mr. V. van der Westhuizen (for Director Highveld Region, Potchefstroom) referred to 'Problem Animal Management Course' and wrote:

- Pursuant to discussions between Mr. P.E. Kingwill (Chairperson: National Problem Animal Control Committee), Mr. G.P. Visagie (Director: Specialist Services, Chief Directorate: Nature and Environmental Conservation) and the Potchefstroom College of Agriculture during the Problem Animal Forum at Golden Gate from 4-5 May 1993, the possibility was investigated to incorporate such a course as part of the curriculum at the Potchefstroom College of Agriculture.
- Therefore, it was a pleasure to inform the Committee that a Problem Animal Management Course has been presented from 21-25 February 1994 at the Potchefstroom College of Agriculture.
- The course was part of a number of short courses that, as an optional, formed part of the curriculum. Very good feedback and interest was experienced and a positive reaction received from course attendees and personnel.
- It was envisaged to present such a course annually. The possibility could also be investigated to extend the course for non *bona fide* students if there was interest.
- The success and good feedback was primarily ascribed to the very good teamwork between the Directorate: Nature and Environmental Conservation, the Subsection: Problem Animals and the Agricultural College. The first two institutions mentioned were responsible for presenting the theoretical and practical parts of the course, while the latter two were responsible for the infrastructure (lecture rooms, experimental farm, facilities, etc.).
- The Committee was thanked for its initiative and contribution to present the course.

In a letter dated 11 March 1994[653] to Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC), Mr. N. Ferreira (First Nature Conservation Specialist, PAO) wrote:

- Reference was made to the previous letter of 7 December 1993. The Directorate accepted the norms for problem animal hunters and instructors, which was compiled by the NPAPC.
- An offer was extended to host the next meeting of the NPAPC.

In a letter dated 17 March 1994[654], Mrs. Jiu Potter (Secretary: Henderson Farmers' & Woolgrowers' Association, Cathcart) wrote to Mr. N.J. Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) and expressed their interest in the letter regarding problem animals and requested as copy of the English version of the document. (Handwritten note on the filed letter: A copy of the English version of the document was posted on 21 March 1994).

In a letter dated 19 March 1994[655] to Mr. N.J. Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC), Mr. C.J. de Jager (Prieska) requested information regarding problem animal control.

- A National Problem Animal Policy Strategy was discussed and a Committee was established. Information in this regard was seen somewhere in the NWGA newsletter and the document was also available from the NWGA.
- However, he was seeking information regarding the behaviour patterns, as well as all other printed information on the black-backed jackal, such as the name of a book for example.
- (Handwritten note on the filed letter: Dirk Brand was phoned on 4 May 1994 and he would send the information.)

[652] File 14/2/1 Department of Agricultural Development, Administration: House of Assembly, Potchefstroom. (Enquiry: J. Louw)
[653] File WK 40D, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.
[654] File WK 40 (b), NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee, Strategiese Plan.
[655] File WK 40 (a), NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

In a letter dated 21 March 1994[656] to Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC), Mr. G.D. Laws (Conservator Northern Zones, Natal Parks Board, Howick) wrote:

"*Attached please find two lists of problem animal hunters / instructors that we are aware of in the Natal Parks Board. This is the best information which we have and there are without doubt a few individuals not included*." Attached to the letter was a "*List of Problem Animal Hunters & Instructors Natal Region, G.D. Laws – Natal Parks Board*", namely: Mr. P. Potgieter (Dannhauser), Mr. C. Dowling, Mr. L. Kunene (c/o J. Landman, Newcastle), Mr. P. Eustace (Himeville), Mr. T. Briscoe (Underberg), Mr. L. McLean (Himeville) and Mr. T. Tomkinson (Tomkinson Safaris).

In a letter dated 29 March 1994[657] to Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC), Mr. N. Ferreira (First Nature Conservation Specialist, PAO) wrote:

- There were no private problem animal instructors in the Orange Free State. Officials of the Directorate provided all training.
- The following problem animal hunters [plus telephone numbers] had permits to hunt with hounds, trap cages and poison ejectors: J. Kok and J. Wessels (Boshof), G.S.G. le Roux (Edenville), J.B. Strydom (Warden), A.H. Vosloo (Bloemspruit), F.J. du Toit (Smithfield) and P. du Kok (Senekal).
- The following problem animal hunters [plus telephone numbers] were only hunting with hounds: H.F.F. de Bruyn (Warden), H.S. Fouché (Rouxville), C.D. Kruger (Bethulie), V.P.L. le T.W. Roux (Bethulie), T.W. Schmidt (Memel), J.J. Swanepoel (Smithfield), W. de la Rosa (Reddersburg), J.M. du Plooy (Ficksburg) and J. Pienaar (Winburg).
- (Handwritten note attached to the letter: 'Hallo Nico. Herewith an updated list of hunters as requested during the meeting. Greetings Niël').

27 April 1994

South Africa[658] (**Annexure A**) changed constitutionally since 27 April 1994 with the birth of nine new provinces (**Annexure B**) and thus nine provincial governments, namely: Western Cape, Eastern Cape, Northern Cape, Free State, North West, Mpumalanga, KwaZulu-Natal, Gauteng and Limpopo Provinces. This created the "1-plus-9" scenario, namely a national department and nine provincial departments. Two "1-plus-9" groupings had direct effects on livestock farmers and wildlife ranchers, namely the national department of agriculture and the national department of environmental affairs, each with nine provincial departments. Given the inevitable geopolitical reorganisation and redeployment of national and provincial government officials with the concomitant loss of institutional memory, the recommendations of the Problem Animal Control Forum simply faded without being implemented[659].

In a letter dated 5 May 1994[660] to Mr. C.J. de Jager (Prieska), Mr. N.J. Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) responded to a request regarding 'Problem animal control: The Black-backed jackal':

- Receipt of the letter was acknowledged and the inquiry regarding problem animal control and the behaviour patterns of black-backed jackals. The matter was referred to the Northern Cape Department: Nature and Environment Conservation and as soon as the Secretariat received feedback, it will be provided to Mr. de Jager.

[656] File WK 40D, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.
[657] File N10/1/81 Directorate: Nature & Environmental Conservation, Orange Free State Provincial Administration.
[658] Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, Act 108 of 1996. As adopted on 8 May 1996 and amended on 11 October 1996 by the Constitutional Assembly. ISBN 978-0-621-39063-6.
[659] De Waal, H.O., 2009. Recent advances in co-ordinated predator management in South Africa. Merino SA Focus 2009, 44-46.
[660] File WK 40 (a), NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.

Version 5.0 HO de Waal Version 5.0

In a letter dated 26 May 1994[661] to Mr. C.J. de Jager (Prieska), Mr. N.J. Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) referred to his previous letter dated 5 May 1994 regarding 'Problem animal control: The Black-backed jackal' and wrote:

- Included was an extract[662] from 'Mammals of the southern African sub-region' by R.H.N. Smithers, 1983.
- It was trusted the information would be sufficient.

In a letter dated 14 June 1994[663], Mr. Neil Fraser (Senior Inspector, SPCA National Council of Southern Africa) referred Mr. N.J. Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) to the National Policy and Strategy for Problem Animal Control in South Africa and requested if any new developments in the field of problem animal control by the committee could be forwarded.

In a letter dated 21 June 1994[664] to Mr. Neil Fraser (Senior Inspector, SPCA National Council of Southern Africa), Mr. N.J. Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) acknowledged receipt of his letter of 14 June 1994 and requested more specific detail on the specific information needed.

In a letter dated 15 June 1994[665] to Mr. N.J. Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC), Mr. P.F. de Villiers (Chairperson: Problem Animal Control Committee, Free State) referred to 'Problem Animal Control Committee: Free State Region' and wrote:

- A meeting was held on 25 May 1994 in Bloemfontein and attended by representatives of NWGA, RPO, OFS Problem Animal Hunters Association, RSC Bloemarea and the Directorate Nature and Environmental Conservation. The meeting was convened to constitute a problem animal control committee for the Free State Region. The following persons were elected as members: Mr. P.F. de Villiers (Chairperson), Directorate Nature and Environmental Conservation; Mr. E.L. Hugo (Secretary), Directorate Nature and Environmental Conservation; Mr. J.C. Strydom, OFS Problem Animal Hunters Association; Mr. W.J. Wessels, RPO; and Mr. S.J. Fourie, RPO.
- The committee would not meet on set dates but as needed.

In a letter dated 16 June 1994[666] to Mr. N.J. Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC), Mr. G.P. (Vis) Visagie wrote:

- He thanked Mr. Nico Vermaak for the card wishing him well on his birthday. It not only reminded him about the many hours – days – months – years that passed by, but also that he should inform the Committee that he was retiring with early pension at the end of June.
- Although he was of late not an active member any more, he followed the activities of all and wishes everybody the best for the future.

In a letter dated 25 June 1994[667] to Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPACP), Mr. J.C. Strydom (OFS Problem Animal Hunters Association, Warden) wrote:

- He referred to their recent telephone conversation and was pleased to provide the following information.
- Three meetings were held on 25 May 1994, namely: (1) Executive meeting OFS Hunters Association. (2) Founding meeting of an OFS Problem Animal Control Committee. (3) OFS Hunters Association and Nature Conservation.

[661] File WK 40 (a), NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.
[662] Editor's Note: No. 259 *Canis mesomelas* Schreber, 1778. Rooijakkals Black-backed jackal, pp 420-423.
[663] File WK 40 (b), NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee, Strategiese Plan.
[664] File WK 40 (b), NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee, Strategiese Plan.
[665] File N3/18/1 Department of Agriculture and Environmental Affairs, Orange Free State Provincial Administration.
[666] File Chief Directorate: Nature and Environmental Conservation, Transvaal Provincial Administration, Pretoria.
[667] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.

Version 5.0 HO de Waal Version 5.0

1. At the meeting of the OFS Hunters Association, the following information was noted for the Saamjag Hunt Club which operated from Boshof and served the districts of Boshof, Hertzogville, Bultfontein, Soutpan and Dealesville: Total ha – 318 209; registered members – 198 and income – R115 603.00. During in the relevant financial year they killed 19 caracal, 250 black-backed jackals, 165 Cape foxes and 3 vagrant dogs. Calculated on only the caracal and black-backed jackals it cost R429.75 to kill a single problem animal.

   The club had 2 white hunters, 3 black hunters, 3 black assistants, and 1 black assistant at the hound kennels, as well as employing the wives of the 2 hunters. Their monthly expenses were ± R15 000.00, that is R180 000.00 per year.

   It was clear that the Saamjag Hunt Club could not survive without very urgent financial support.

2. For Mr. F. du Toit (Smithfield) the situation was the following: 128 members, serving about 180 000 ha, employed 1 white hunter, 2 black hunters, and 2 black assistants, while Mr. du Toit himself was fulltime involved

   His income was such that he could not draw a salary himself. Mr. du Toit's farming activities supported him. Therefore, his farming activities subsidised his hunt activities.

3. Mr. J de Bruyn (Warden; he was not a registered member of the Hunter Association) serviced 30 registered members, serving an area of 55 131 ha, with an income of R21 028.00. He experienced financial difficult with the possibility of a judicial sale of his bakkie. He employed 3 blacks.

4. His own situation with 20 years fulltime experience in problem animal control was: 165 registered members, serving and area of 227 140 ha. He serviced the districts of Harrismith, Warden, Memel, Vrede, Frankfort, Villiers, Reitz, Bethlehem, and part of the Heilbron district.

   His personnel comprised himself, 3 very experienced black hound hunters (± 25 years' service each), 3 black assistants, 3 blacks trained to use poison ejectors, foothold traps and cage traps and 1 black man taking care of the hound at the kennels. His total income for the year was R103 173.91. Problem animals killed during the year were 219 black-backed jackals and 17 caracal with an average cost of R437.17 per animal killed.

- From the income and expenses of the hunters, it was clear that no one could survive without financial support.
- It would be a sad day if the few hunters had to leave the industry. They were very experienced people with very good experience in vermin control. The 21 black people were indispensable for the industry and could not be replaced.
- After the disbanding of Oranjejag Nature Conservation continued to pay the personnel for 6 months until 31 December 1993. Thereafter the men left the industry because they did not see a financial future for themselves. If there were financial support from the start, he was sure some of the men would have continued in the industry.
- Regarding the Provincial Policy Committee, he had certain problems. He requested that the functions of the committee should be determined before nominating the members. Mr. W.J. Wessels felt that the committee should only be coordinating. The Hunters Association felt the OFS Committee should assist in solving problems at ground level. If the problems could not be solved the committee should refer the matter to National Committee. Mr. W.J. Wessels did not want to know anything about work.
- In the Cape Province, the RSCs provide financial support to vermin control. In Natal, there was a bounty of R40 per caracal and black-backed jackal for anybody who showed a skin at the magistrate's office. In the Free State, the RSCs said it was not their problem. Nature Conservation said there were no funds. The OFS Hunters Association asked what happened to the money that was always available at Oranjejag. Part of that money could keep the current hunters in the industry. A fair subsidy would be R1 for every R1 the hunters received from their members.

Version 5.0 HO de Waal - Version 5.0

- At the meeting of the OFS Hunters Association and Nature Conservation discussion focussed mostly on finances. Nature Conservation's position was that there was no money.
- Furthermore, the Hunters had a problem with the training of farmers to use poison ejectors.

Firstly, it was very dangerous for the hunt hounds. If there was not good liaison between Nature Conservation, the trained farmers and hunters, only problems were foreseen.

Secondly, it took business from the hunters and would only lead to the extermination of innocent Cape foxes at a very large scale. He was the only person in the Free State who could legally load and sell sodium cyanide cartridges. Therefore, many farmers contacted him and on enquiry, he was told about the number of Cape foxes killed.

Thirdly, experienced hunters knew that vermin control was very much a specialised activity and should be left for the fulltime professional hunters. Peter Fleischack of Kimberley was not buying poison ejectors in the Cape Province and selling it to Free State farmers. In the Cape Province farmers been trained for years. Apparently, the poison ejector had no role there anymore.

- Therefore, it was clear why the letter had to be addressed to the National Committee. Up to this level, they fighting at closed doors. He quoted from the Policy Document where it stated expressly that it was agreed what the responsibility of the State was, namely on p 3 paragraph 2.2.1 'Providing financial support to problem animal control organisations in regions / provinces wherever needed.' Then a myriad of excuses were offered for it.
- An apology was offered for the lengthy written representation, but it was needed to provide insight in the hunter's dilemma. It was trusted they would get the support for the battle.
- Greetings from an icy Free State.

In a letter dated 18 July 1994[668] to Mr. J.C. Strydom (OFS Problem Animal Hunters Association, Warden) and also copied to Mr. P.E. Kingwill (Chairperson: NPAPC) and Dr. L.P. Stoltz (Director: Free State Nature and Environment Conservation), Mr. N.J. Vermaak (Secretary: NPACP) referred to 'Funding of hunt clubs: Orange Free State Province' and wrote:

- Reference was made to the letter dated 25 June 1994 and received by the Secretariat on 12 July 1994.
- The content was noted and it was referred to the Director: Nature Conservation in the Free State Province. In a telephone conversation with Dr. L.P. Stoltz, it became clear that the Free State Provincial Administration financed Hunt Clubs in the Free State on an ad hoc basis. The request as stated in the letter was submitted to Dr. Stoltz, namely to consider a long-term financial programme for Hunt Associations in the Orange Free State and the proposal of a R1 for R1 contribution by the Authority was conveyed to Dr. Stoltz.
- A copy of the letter was also send for cognisance to Mr. P.E. Kingwill, National Chairperson.
- Mr. Strydom would be kept informed about feedback received from the Free State Provincial Administration.

In a letter dated 18 July 1994[669] to Dr. L.P. Stoltz (Director: Free State Nature and Environment Conservation) and copied to Mr. P.E. Kingwill (Chairperson: NPAPC) and Mr. J.C. Strydom (OFS Problem Animal Hunters Association, Warden), Mr. N.J. Vermaak (Secretary: NPACP) referred to 'Funding of hunt clubs: Orange Free State Province' and wrote:

- Reference was made to their telephone conversation regarding the matter.
- It seemed there was a definite identified need for financial support from the Authority in the Free State for problem animal hunters. The proposal by Mr. Strydom, on behalf of the

[668] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.
[669] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

OFS Problem Animal Hunters Association, was an annual contribution of R1 for R1 from the Authority to Hunt Clubs. The content of the letter suggested that the Hunters Association wanted to negotiate a long-term financial programme with the Administration for their members and not rely on *ad hoc* arrangements or once off payment of cash advances.

- The forthcoming meeting of the NPAPC was scheduled to convene on a date from 16 to 31 May 1995; therefore, the matter was forwarded in advance for attention.
- It would be appreciated if he could assist the NPAPC in this matter.

In a letter dated 8 August 1994[670] to Mr. N.J. Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC), Mr. J.S. Botha (for the General Manager: Western Cape Agricultural Union, Paarl) wrote about 'Inquiries about rights and obligations of landowners regarding vagrant dogs':

- He referred to the representations of the Western Cape Agricultural Union (WC AU) on 1 October 1993 and the Secretary's letter of 6 December 1993.
- Inquiry was made regarding the progress made thus far. The WC AU's Executive was meeting on 25 August 1994 and the information was needed to communicate at the meeting.
- Cooperation was appreciated.

In a letter dated 16 August 1994[671] to Mr. Dirk Brand (Acting Director General: Northern Cape Department of Nature and Environment Conservation, Kimberley), Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) referred to 'Congratulations: Appointment as Acting Director General: Nature and Environment Conservation' and wrote:

- On belt of the president and members of the NPAPC, he was congratulated with the appointment as Acting Director General: Nature and Environment Conservation.
- It was trusted his appointment in the Northern Cape would be greatly appreciated.

In a letter dated 16 August 1994[672] to Mr. J.E. Lensing (Acting Director: Northern Cape Department of Nature and Environment Conservation, Kimberley), Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) referred to 'Congratulations: Appointment as Acting Director: Nature and Environment Conservation' and wrote:

- On behalf of the president and members of the NPAPC, he was congratulated with the appointment as Acting Director: Nature and Environment Conservation.

It was trusted his appointment in the Northern Cape would be greatly appreciated. (Handwritten note by Nico Vermaak on the letter: Our official comments on your policy documents and strategic plan is on its way! greetings).

In a faxed letter dated 5 September 1994[673] to Mr. J.S. Botha (for General Manager: Western Cape Agricultural Union, Paarl), Mr. N.J. Vermaak (Secretary: NPACP) responded about 'Inquiries: Rights and obligations of landowners: Vagrant dogs':

- Reference was made to the faxed letter of 8 August 1994 (Ref 3/8/1).
- The matter was explained in detail in a previous letter dated 2 March 1994.
- Feedback was received from the Division Cape Nature Conservation and Museums, CPA. The previous letter and annexures were included.

In a letter dated 15 September 1994[674] to Mr. Nico Vermaak (Assistant Manager: Operational Services, NWGA, Port Elizabeth), Mr. B.R. Wilkinson (Director-General: Province of KwaZulu-Natal) referred to 'Policy control of dogs on regional level' and wrote:

[670] File 3/8/1 Western Cape Agricultural Union, Paarl.
[671] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.
[672] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.
[673] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.
[674] File 12/3/4/P Province of KwaZulu-Natal, Pietermaritzburg (Enquiries M. Skinner).

Version 5.0 : NO de Waal – Version 5.0

"*Your letter dated 5 September 1994 refers.*

A draft Act on the Licensing and Control of Dogs in KwaZulu-Natal has been submitted to Minister G.S. Bartlett (Minister of Agriculture) for consideration."

In a letter dated 13 October 1994[675] to Mr. M. le Grange, Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) referred to their telephone conversation on Thursday 13 October 1994 regarding the NPAPC and provided the following information:

- A **National Problem Animal Policy Committee** was established in 1991 as the result of the dissatisfaction among especially small livestock farmers regarding the ineffective control of the losses caused by problem animals.
- The primary goal of the National Policy Committee was to act as a Liaison and Coordinating Forum and direct the power and expertise of the Authority and stakeholder groups in agriculture to achieve consensus on policy and approach at the national level regarding aspects of problem animal control. In the current circumstances, it was also imperative to ensure that recommended control methods were ecologically and ethically acceptable.
- The National Policy Committee strived to act as facilitator regarding aspects relating to communication, control methods, training, research and development. The Committee succeeded gather a broad spectrum of stakeholders, namely NWGA, RPO, SALU, Problem Animal Control Organisations, RSCs' Association and the Departments of Nature Conservation of all the Provinces, including the Natal Parks Board, around the same table and representatives of these organisations attended the annual meeting of the National Policy Committee.
- **National Policy and Strategy**
- The National Policy Committee drafted with the input and consideration of the different viewpoints of all role players a National Policy and Strategy for Problem Animal Control in South Africa that have been officially ratified by all the organisations.
- The National Policy Committee has no executive powers or funds and was depending on all involved organisations to implement the strategies. Therefore, the Committee drafted a Strategic Action Plan, which allocated responsibilities for specific actions to those best equipped to execute it. The National Policy Document was included for information to show the extent of the initiative and specific detail regarding the objectives. Any inquiries in that regard would be furnished at request.
- **Establishing Provincial Problem Animal Control Committees**
- From the Policy Document and Strategic Action Plan it was apparent that the practical implementation of control measures were to be organised and implemented at the local level. Therefore, Problem Animal Control Committees were also needed at the local level. In Natal, a Provincial Problem Animal Control Committee was already operating for several years with very positive results for the community in that region.
- It was emphasised that it was the task of the Policy Committee to coordinate policy regarding problem animal control, research etc. and the Policy Committee did not involve itself in the physical control of problem animals.
- At a recent meeting the National Policy Committee recommended again that Provincial Problem Animal Control Committees, similar to that in Natal, be established in the different regions where the provincial Agricultural Unions, namely Transvaal, Free State and Western, Eastern and Northern Cape, render services. It was further recommended that these to be established provincial Committees engage all stakeholders at the local level, for example the Provincial Nature Conservation Authorities, Hunt Organisations (when applicable) and possibly the relevant RSCs. For possible financial support of these to be established

[675] File WK 40 (b), NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee, Strategiese Plan.

Version 5.0 - Hoe de Waal

Committees they may consider approaching the local Provincial or Regional Authorities and the RSCs for contributions.

- Requests have been directed to the different Provincial Agricultural Unions, the NWGA and RPO to support the founding of the Provincial Problem Animal Control Committees. Such Committees have been established in the Transvaal and Free State in 1994. Feedback received from the Eastern, Northern and Western Cape suggests there was no need for such a Committee to address challenges regarding problem animals at ground level.
- **Positive consequences**
- A practical consequence of the initiative to engage all role players involved in problem animal control was the Problem Animal Control Forum that convened under the auspices of the National Policy Committee at Golden Gate on 4 and 5 May 1993.
- Valuable information was shared among all stakeholders including farmers, problem animal hunters, nature conservation scientists as well as representatives of RSCs and Provincial Authorities, which could contribute at a broad level to the effective control of problem animals.
- The solution to challenges regarding problem animal control at ground level still lies in establishing a Provincial or Regional Problem Animal Control Committee where all stakeholders were involved. It was suggested that it should be considered to establish such a Committee for the region at the forthcoming meeting on Monday 17 October 1994 as alluded to by Mr. le Grange.
- Contact persons on the National Policy Committee were provided, namely Mr. J.E. Lensing (Director: Nature and Environment Conservation, Northern Cape Province), Mr. F.J. du Toit (OVS Problem Animal Hunters Association) and Mr. P.E. Kingwill (Chairperson: NPAPC).

1995

In a faxed message dated 8 February 1995[676] to Mr. Dirk Brand (Acting Director General: Northern Cape Department of Nature Conservation, Kimberley), Mrs. Bonita Francis (Operations Assistant: NWGA) provided a copy of a letter dated 8 July 1993 (General Manager: Northern Cape Agricultural Union, Kimberley re 'Establishing: Provincial Problem Animal Control Committees') and a copy of a letter dated 30 August 1993 (response by Mr. J.M. Laubscher, Manager: Operations and General Services, Northern Cape Agricultural Union, Kimberley).

In a letter dated 9 June 1995[677] to Mr. J.E. Lensing (Acting Director: Northern Cape Nature Conservation Services, Kimberley), Mr. Kevin van Tonder (Secretary: NPAPC) referred to 'Interprovincial Problem Animal Committee' and wrote:

- At the recent meeting of the NPAPC on 24 May 1995, it was decided to activate an Interprovincial Problem Animal Committee if there was sufficient work for such a Committee. Mr. Lensing was requested to take the lead and the Secretariat would appreciate to be kept informed on progress.
- Acknowledging receipt of the letter was requested.

In a fax dated 12 June 1995[678] to Mr. G.M. Schutte (Manager: RPO), Mrs. Patti Myburgh (NWGA of South Africa) referred to the RPO's contribution for Secretarial Services of the NPAPC:

[676] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.
[677] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.
[678] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.

Version 5.0 - HC de Waal - Version 5.0

- In the 1994/95 Financial Year an amount of R4 500.00 was budgeted for personnel cost in operating the Secretariat. The RPO was requested to consider making a payment for 50% (R2 250.00) to the NWGA.
- It would be appreciated if the decision to comply with request could be communicated as soon as possible.
- The NWGA's financial year ends on 30 June, therefore it would be appreciated if the cheque could be received as soon as possible
- They could be contacted for more information.

In a letter dated 27 June 1995[679] to Mrs. Patti Myburgh (NWGA of South Africa), Mr. G.M. Schutte (Manager: RPO) attached a cheque to the amount of R2 250.00 for services rendered to the NPAPC and expressed appreciation for the good work done in this regard.

In a fax dated 16 June 1995[680] from Mrs. Patti Myburgh (NWGA of South Africa) to Mr. G.M. Schutte (Manager: RPO) the RPO's payment of R2 250.00 for Secretarial Services of the NPAPC was acknowledged.

In a letter dated 4 July 1995[681] to the Manager National RPO (Pretoria), Mr. J.S. Botha (for the General Manager: Western Cape Agricultural Union, Paarl) wrote regarding 'Poison collars designed for lambs':

- During the course of the first six months of the year, the Union held nine regional congresses in its service area. On such a regional congress was held at Nelspoort.
- The regional congress discussed the problems of livestock farmers with reference to appropriate and affordable poison collars for lambs. The following resolution was adopted by the regional congress: '*The congress requested that the CSIR be approached to design a poison collar which would protect lambs against vermin at a price which can be afforded by individual farmers to protect the whole or the largest part of the lamb crop*.'
- It was trusted the request would be considered and taken further.

On 4 July 1995[682] Mr. J.S. Botha (for the Executive General Manager, Western Cape Agricultural Union, Paarl) wrote to Mr. K.A. van Tonder (Manager: NPAPC) regarding 'Poison collars designed for lambs':

- Receipt was acknowledged of the letter with attachment dated 28 September 1995 and it was forwarded to the Union's affiliation for their attention and comments.
- If any feedback were received, it would be communicated.

In a letter dated 5 July 1995[683] to the Manager SAAU RPO (Pretoria), Mr. J.S. Botha (for the General Manager: Western Cape Agricultural Union, Paarl) wrote regarding 'Vagrant dogs':

- A while ago, the Union received clarity from the CPAPC on the position of landowners regarding vagrant dogs.
- This only referred to cases where vagrant dogs transgressed on the property of landowners. In that regard there is clarity about the rights and obligations of landowners.
- The problem experienced were cases where landowners follow the tracks of a vagrant dog or dogs and when it is found at its rightful owner the landowner is prevented from destroying the vagrant dog.

[679] File 14/1/8 Red Meat Producers' Organisation, Pretoria.
[680] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.
[681] File Western Cape Agricultural Union, Paarl.
[682] File 3/2/14/9 Executive General Manager, Western Cape Agricultural Union, Paarl.
[683] File 3/2/14/5 Western Cape Agricultural Union, Paarl.

Version 5.0 - NO de Wet - Version 5.0

- The conclusion was that landowners were not sufficiently protected and at the same time, there was no clarity about the correct way landowners should act. It was necessary to get urgent clarity on the uncertainty about the rights of landowners in such cases.
- It was trusted assistance could be provided in this matter.

In a fax dated 18 July 1995[684] to the Secretary: NPAPC (Port Elizabeth), Mr. G.M. Schutte (General Manager: RPO) referred to 'Vagrant dogs Poison collars for lambs' and wrote:

- Attached were two letters[685] from the Western Cape RPO for the urgent attention of the NPAPC. The WC RPO may be answered directly but copied also to the National RPO.
- Attention to this matter would be appreciated.

In a letter dated 19 July 1995[686] to Mr. L.H. Fick (Minister of Agriculture, Western Cape Province, Cape Town), Mr. K.A. van Tonder (Secretary: NPAPC) referred to the topic of 'Control of vagrant dogs' and wrote:

"I refer to the above matter and attach hereto a letter received from the Western Cape Agricultural Union which is self explanatory.

Could you kindly look into the matter and advise the writer hereof as to what rights a landowner has in terms of vagrant dogs, traced to the property of their lawful owners. Vagrant dogs are a nuisance to say the least and can cause hundreds of rands damage in stock loss. Farmers should have remedies to protect their rights in this regard.

Your urgent advises in this regard will be appreciated."

In a letter dated 19 July 1995[687] to Mr. G. Schutte (General Manager: RPO, Pretoria), Mr. K.A. van Tonder (Secretary: NPAPC) acknowledged receipt of the fax of 18 July 1995 regarding 'Vagrant dogs Poison collars for lambs' and wrote the matter was receiving urgent attention.

In a letter dated 19 July 1995[688] to Dr. D.F. Toerien (Executive Vice President, CSIR, Pretoria), Mr. K.A. van Tonder (Secretary: NPAPC) wrote regarding 'Poison collars for lambs' and wrote:

- Attached was a copy of a letter received from the Western Cape Agricultural Union.
- A discussion point was adopted at a regional congress requesting the CSIR to design a cheaper collar which would protect lambs against vermin
- Input in this regard would be appreciated.

In a letter dated 25 July 1995[689] to Mr. K.A. van Tonder (Secretary: NPAPC), Dr. D.F. Toerien (Director: Division for Manufacturing and Aviation Systems Technology, CSIR, Pretoria), responded regarding 'Poison collars for lambs' and wrote:

- Receipt was acknowledged of the letter dated 19 July 1995 with an attachment.
- He was currently in a new position, but because the request was addressed to him in his previous position, the request was forwarded to Dr. G.G. Garret, Executive Vice President: Operations and currently also Acting President of the CSIR.

In a letter dated 27 July 1995[690] to Mr. K.A. van Tonder (Secretary: NPAPC), Mr. Danie Niemand (Private Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture, Planning and Tourism) wrote regarding 'Vagrant dogs':

[684] File 14/1/8 General Manager: National RPO, Pretoria.
[685] Editor's Note: refer to the letters dated 4 and 5 July 1995 from the Western Cape Agricultural Union, Paarl.
[686] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.
[687] File 14/1/8 General Manager: National RPO, Pretoria.
[688] File WK 40 (a), NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.
[689] File U/Pr/7/1 Division for Manufacturing and Aviation Systems Technology, CSIR, Pretoria.
[690] File 3/4/1(95) Ministry of Agriculture, Planning and Tourism, Province of the Western Cape, Cape Town.

Version 5.0 - Nicole Waal - Version 5.0

"*Receipt by Mr. L.H. Fick, Minister of Agriculture, Planning and Tourism of your letter dated 19 July 1995 is hereby acknowledge.*

Your representations are receiving attention and further communication will follow as soon as possible."

In a letter dated 23 August 1995[691] to Mr. K.A. van Tonder (Secretary: NPAPC), Mr. J.J. du Plessis (Manager: Production, SA Wool Board, Port Elizabeth) referred to 'Statistical Data: Problem Animal Control' and wrote:

- The only statistical data regarding problem animal control which could be retrieved was the following from a survey by BKB and Stockowners in Natal:

Region	Sheep in survey	Sheep killed by Jackal/ Caracal	Sheep killed dogs	% Predators	Sheep stolen	% stolen
Bergville/Winterton	3 000	72	-	3.75	45	3.33
Boston	3 080	293	-	9.51	191	6.20
Cedarville/Matatiele	53 380	613	87	1.31	350	0.65
Dundee	21 800	423	22	2.00	321	1.47
Greytown	2 165	138	14	7.02	49	2.00
Kokstad	43 100	740	45	1.82	764	1.77
Ladysmith/Elandslaagte	13 400	569	10	4.02	154	1.06
Mooirivier	12 997	423	22	3.42	321	2.46
Newcastle	9 850	483	27	5.10	134	1.36
Swartberg	40 650	1 001	56	2.60	581	1.42
Underberg	6 700	269	60	4.90	190	2.83
Utrecht	42 700	440	5	1.04	190	0.44
Vryheid/Pietermaritzburg	21 750	541	13	2.54	191	0.87
Wakkerstroom/Ingogo	50 400	793	-	1.57	252	0.50
Total	331 022	6 931	402	-	3 609	-
%	44	2.1	0.12	-	1.08	-

Summary

1. According to the wool received in Durban during the 1993/94-wool season, it was estimated that were750 000 sheep in Natal. The Survey covered 44% of the total.
2. Sheep losses ascribed to black-backed jackals and caracal represented 2.1% of the sheep in the survey.
3. Only 0.12% of the losses were ascribed to dogs.
4. One percent (1%) of the losses were due to livestock theft.

- The losses ascribed to predators, dogs and theft amounted to 3.22% of the sheep in the survey.
- The estimated losses in monetary value could be expressed as 10 942 sheep @ R250 each = R2 735 000.
- The estimated losses amounted to 44% of the total number of sheep in Natal. It could therefore be assumed that the total losses may amount to more than R5 million per year.

In a letter dated 24 August 1995[692] to Mr. K.A. van Tonder (Secretary: NPAPC), Mr. L.H. Fick (Minister of Agriculture, Planning and Tourism, Western Cape Province, Cape Town) responded regarding 'Vagrant dogs':

"*Your representation dated 19 July 1995 on the control of vagrant dogs, refers.*

Apart from theft, the loss of animals due to vagrant dogs is surely one of the most serious problems stock farmers experience. Furthermore, it is always a highly emotional situation

[691] File 86/2/1 South African Wool Board, Port Elizabeth.
[692] File 3/4/1(95) Ministry of Agriculture, Planning and Tourism, Province of the Western Cape, Cape Town.

Version 5.0 - HD de Waal, Version 5.0

which is often aggravated by stock owners losing their temper and quite often presence of mind. But who can blame them?

In essence, this is something that should be scrutinized by and advised on by legal advisors.

According to the SAPS, a stock owner may not confiscate or destroy the offending dog if it is found on the premises of its owner.

A formal charge has to be laid at the nearest police station. The SAPS will then take the matter further.

It seems to me that in order for stock owners to get a more satisfactory solution to this sensitive problem, stock owners, your committee and the SAPS should go into consultation."

In a letter dated 5 September 1995[693] to Mr. J.S. Botha (for the General Manager: Western Cape Agricultural Union, Paarl), Mr. K.A. van Tonder (Secretary: NPAPC) wrote regarding 'Vagrant dogs':

- Reference was made to the letter dated 5 July 1995, Ref 3/2/14/5 which was addressed to SAAU RPO.
- A letter was addressed to the Ministry of Agriculture, Planning and Tourism of the Western Cape Province to obtain clarity in this regard.
- As seen in the letter received from Mr. L.H. Fick, Minister and according to the SAPS, a landowner may not confiscate or destroy the specific dog if it is found on the property of its owner. The letters were attached for information.
- Further directions are requested in this regard.

In a letter dated 8 September 1995[694] to the Provincial Commission of Inquiry into the Restructuring of Agriculture in the Free State, Glen (Attention: Gela Naude), Mr. J.J. Blom (for the Head: Legislation, Impact Studies and Rural Development, PAO, Bloemfontein) referred to 'Enquiry: National Wool Growers' Association: Free State Congress 1995' and wrote:

1. Reference was made to a fax, G Naude/10/2/1/3/4, dated 95/08/28.

a) <u>Provincial Problem Animal Control Committee: Free State Region</u>

A founding meeting has already been held in Bloemfontein on 25 May 1994, at which were present representatives of the NWGA, RPO, OFS Problem Animal Hunters Association, RSC Bloemarea and the erstwhile Directorate Nature Conservation and Environmental Affairs.

At the meeting the following members were elected to the committee: Mr. P.F. de Villiers (Chairperson), Directorate Nature and Environmental Conservation; Mr. E.L. Hugo (Secretary), Directorate Nature and Environmental Conservation; Mr. J.C. Strydom, OFS Problem Animal Hunters Association; Mr. W.J. Wessels, RPO; and Mr. S.J. Fourie, RPO.

The committee would not meet at determined dates but as required.

A meeting would be convened in the near future to attend to some problems and elect another chairperson and secretary if Mr. P.F. de Villiers and Mr. E.L. Hugo were not available any more.

b) <u>Financial assistance to private hunters in the Free State</u>

The erstwhile Directorate Nature and Environmental Conservation paid the following subsidies in April 1994: Mr. J.C. Strydom (R9 000), Mr. H.J.J. de Bruin (R3 000) and OFS Problem Animal Hunters Association (R7 603).

It must be remembered the service was privatised and that subsidies were paid in the past to support private problem animal hunters financially after the disbanding of the erstwhile hunt organisation 'Oranjejag'.

The amount of R700 000, which the erstwhile Directorate Nature and Environmental Conservation paid in the past as subsidy to the erstwhile 'Oranjejag' was not available in

[693] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.
[694] File N3/18/1 Department of Agriculture and Environmental Affairs, Orange Free State Provincial Administration.

Version 5.0 - HC de Waal - Version 5.0

the current budget and could therefore not be used to pay private problem animal hunters as in the past.

The functions of the department of Agriculture and Environmental Affairs regarding problem animal control encompassed providing training, control appliances and advice. The annual expenditure for the function already amounted to R216 892 which had be financed from the department's budget.

2. It was trusted the information was adequate.

In a fax dated 21 September 1995[695] to Mr. K.A. van Tonder (Secretary: NPAPC), Dr. M. Horak (CSIR Food Science and Technology, Pretoria) responded to the letter dated 19 July 1995 to Dr. D.F. Toerien regarding 'Poison collars for lambs' and wrote:

- The past weeks the CSIR launched an investigation into the possibility to design poison collars for lambs as requested by the Western Cape Agricultural Union. Unfortunately, from the CSIR's viewpoint it would in all probability not be possible to be successful with such a project.
- They CSIR acknowledged in appreciation that it was approached in this regard.

In a letter dated 28 September 1995[696] to Mr. J.S. Botha (for the General Manager: Western Cape Agricultural Union), Mr. K.A. van Tonder (Secretary: NPAPC) responded to the topic 'Poison collars for lambs' and wrote:

- Reference was made to his letter of 4 July 1995. Attached was a fax received from the CSIR in this regard.
- If any ideas could be offered in this regard, the matter would be taken further.

In a handwritten letter dated 19 November 1995[697] to Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC), Mr. N.A. Ferreira (Bloemfontein) informed him that he has stopped working as Nature Conservation Scientist at the address indicated on an attached sticker (Free State Provincial Administration, Bloemfontein). He also requested that no circulars of the NPAPC be send to that address any more. (Handwritten note by Nico Vermaak on the letter: Name removed from list 22 November 1995).

1996

In letters dated 5 March 1996[698] to Mr. J.W.M. Meiring (Minister; Finances and Environment Affairs, Western Cape Province, Cape Town), Dr. J. Neethling (Director: Nature Conservation, Western Cape Province, Cape Town), Mr. E. Sigwela (Minister: Agriculture and Environmental Affairs, Eastern Cape Province, Port Elizabeth) Dr. Mike Cohen (Director: Nature Conservation, Eastern Cape Province, Port Elizabeth), Mr. J. Marais (Minister: Agriculture, environment and Nature Conservation, Kimberley), Mr. Johan Lensing (Director: Nature Conservation, Kimberley), Mr. C Human (Minister: Agriculture and Environmental Affairs, Glen), Mr. H.I. Kleingeld (Chief Director: Agriculture and Environmental Affairs, Free State Province, Glen), Mr. Nkosi N.J. Ngubane (Minister: Environmental Affairs & Traditional Authority, Ulundi), Mr. R Heimer (Director: Environmental Affairs & Traditional Authority, Ulundi), Mr. A. Venter (Minister: Tourism and Environmental Affairs, Province of North West, Mmabatho), Mr. A. Wills (Acting Director: Tourism and Environmental Affairs, Province of North West, Mmabatho), Mr. David Mkwanazi (Minister; Environmental Affairs, Province of Mpumalanga, Nelspruit) and Mr. J.C. Mhlongo (Chief Director: Environmental Affairs, Province of Mpumalanga, Nelspruit), Mr. Abao Kahn (Minister: Conservation and Agriculture, PWV[699]

[695] File CSIR Food Science and Technology, Pretoria.
[696] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.
[697] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.
[698] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.
[699] Editor's Note: apparently the **P**retoria, **W**itwatersrand, **V**ereeniging was in reference to Gauteng Province.

Version 5.0 – HO de Waal – Version 5.0

Province, Marshalltown), Dr. Piet Mulder (Chief Director: Nature Conservation and Agricultural Affairs, PWV Province), Ms. N.M. Sexwale-Mabitje (Minister: Tourism and Environmental Affairs, Province of Northern Transvaal, Pietersburg) and Dr. G. Nel (Chief Director: Environmental Conservation and Tourism, Province of Northern Transvaal, Pietersburg), Mr. J.A. (Jannie) Kemp (Chairperson: NPAPC) referred to 'National Problem Animal Policy Committee' and wrote:

- Background
- The NPAPC was established after role players held workshops and symposia to address the problem animal dilemma in the RSA.
- The extent of the losses experienced by small livestock and cattle producer was researched and it was aimed to determine which control measures should be applied to address these losses.
- After consensus was reached by producers, problem animal hunters, provincial problem animal committees, nature conservation authorities (in the erstwhile Cape, Transvaal, Free State and Natal), National Wool Growers' Association of South Africa (NWGA), SA Wool Board, and Red Meat Producers' Organisation (RPO), it was decided to establish a NPAPC where all these parties were represented to determine policy regarding:
  a) Classification of animals that were causing losses
  b) Control methods
  c) Uniform coordinated control principles
  d) Training of hunters and guidance to producers by approved courses at agricultural colleges
  e) Establish recognised and approved control measures
  f) Remove conflict between producers and nature conversation authorities.
- Future
- In view of the new provincial dispensation in the Republic of South Africa, the NPAPC felt that at the next meeting all Provincial Ministers of Nature Conservation and their Directors would be invited and requested to state their positions and if possible to be present.
- Input regarding the following would be appreciated:
  i. The need for a NPAPC in cooperation with the province.
  ii. The composition of the Committee. In the past, the following role players were involved: Provincial Administrations (Nature Conservation), Natal Parks Board, Red Meat Producers' Organisation, National Wool Growers' Association of South Africa, Federal Problem Animal Association, RSC of South Africa and problem animal hunters.
  iii. The Committee invited the recipient or nominee to attend.
  iv. Express themselves on the continued basis of action to formulate policy and cooperation.
- Detail of meeting
- The Committee would meet on **Wednesday 29 May 1996 at 08h00 at the Horseshoe Motel in Kimberley**. A block reservation to sleep was made at the Holiday Inn Garden Court for the evening of 28 May 1996. The Northern Cape Department of Nature Conservation hosted an informal function.
- Attached was a reservation form to be returned before **30 April 1996**.
- Future existence of Committee
- Problem animals were responsible for the second largest losses after livestock theft, it discouraged producers to engage in small livestock farming, therefore the NWGA, and RPO have indicated that they were in favour of continuing with the Committee.
- This was a positive step to promote small livestock, goats and wool sheep that create employment, job security and foreign exchange for every province and the RSA as a whole.
- A copy of the Committee's policy document was included.
- Speedy feedback was awaited with expectation.

Version 5.0 - Nico de Waal - Version 5.0

In faxed messages dated 3 April 1996[700] to the Elsenburg Agricultural College (for attention Miss. De Kock), the Grootfontein Agricultural College (Handwritten note on letter: Willem Loock and Piet Coetzee), Glen College of Agriculture (Mr. G. van N du Toit) and Cedara College of Agriculture (Dr. A. van Niekerk), Mrs. Bonita Francis (Operations Assistant: NWGA) referred to 'Problem Animals' and wrote:

- The NPAPC was going to hold an important meeting on 29 May 1996 regarding the continuation of the Committee.
- Mr. J.A. Kemp, Chairperson of the Committee wanted to establish whether problem animals (collars, foothold traps, etc.) were included that year in the curricula of the Agricultural Colleges. If indeed, more information would be appreciated.
- Assistance would be appreciated.

In a letter dated 3 April 1996[701] to Mr. M.A. Strydom (Manager: Research and Product Standards, SA Wool Board), Mrs. Bonita Francis (Operations Assistant: NWGA) referred to 'Research' and wrote:

- Mr. J.A. Kemp, Chairperson: NPAPC requested some information for the meeting in May; he needed answers for important questions expected from members during the meeting.
- At the National Congress about 4 years ago, a discussion point dealt with research – not research on a specific topic but research in general. The SA Wool Board would fund it.
- Mr. Kemp inquired regarding the fixed percentage on levy income of the Wool Board for research and if there were, any more funds available the NWGA would like to make use of it.
- A response would be appreciated.

In a letter dated 10 April 1996[702] to the Manager, NWGA of SA (attention Mrs. Bonita Francis), Mr. Willem (W.S.) Loock (for Director: Grootfontein Agricultural Development Institute, Middelburg, EC) referred to 'Problem Animals' and wrote:

- Reference was made to the letter dated 3 April 1996.
- Students at the Grootfontein Agricultural College were indeed trained in problem animal control.
- During 1993, he assisted Mr. W. Lord of Hofmeyr to prepare a lecture for the Problem Animal Forum at Harrismith[703]. He returned the goodwill by providing for the students a demonstration with his hunt hounds.
- Problem animal control was included in the syllabus of the second year for students in Agricultural Organisation Studies. In brief, it dealt with the Act, the ecology of problem animal and the cost of control. More attention was devoted to the control of problem animals with the following methods: cage traps, foothold[704] traps, poison ejectors, hunt hounds, poison and poison collars, electrified fences and hunt with rifles (whistle and cassette - sounds).
- Mr. Peter Schneekluth of Problem Animal Control, Prins Albert, conducted a 2-day course in problem animal control in 1994 and 1995 (for both 1st and 2nd year students). Emphasis was mostly on the use of cage traps and foothold traps, as well as the use of a whistle to call and shoot problem animals[705].
- Students were examined (a test or an examination) on the lectures and demonstrations for problem animal control which were presented by Mr. Schneekluth.

[700] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.
[701] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.
[702] File 13/3/8 Northern Cape Department of Agriculture and Nature Concervation, Middelburg, EC.
[703] Editor's Note: the Forum was held from 4-5 May 1993 at the Golden Gate Highlands National Park.
[704] Editor's Note: At the time these trapping devices were referred to as "gin traps" (in Afrikaans "*slagysters*").
[705] Editor's Note: At the time many still referred to problem animals as "vermin" (in Afrikaans "*ongediertes*").

Version 5.0 - HC de Waal - Version 5.0

- One of the 3rd year students completed a seminar on 'Birds of prey – a conservation priority' as part of the subject Environmental Management III. The seminar was presented to the classmates.
- On 23 April 1996, Mr. Johan Esterhuizen (Birds of Prey Association, Bloemfontein) lectured the 3rd year students in Environmental Management III on the conservation of birds of prey.
- A copy of a photograph and a newspaper clipping reflecting on the problem animal control course at Grootfontein were attached.

On 15 April 1996[706] Mr. M.A. Strydom (Manager: Research and Product Standards, SA Wool Board) responded to the inquiry on 3 April by Mrs. Bonita Francis (Operations Assistant: NWGA) on behalf of Mr. Jannie Kemp regarding 'Research':

- The Board's funding of research was not yet allocated on basis of a formula and no fixed part of levy income was allocated to research. However, it was a long-term goal to move to such a system with an eventual amount equal to 0.5% of the shearing realisation. The idea was to put the income levied in a Research Revolving Fund to fund the Board's total research obligation (i.e. production as well as textile). Because of market conditions, the income of the Board remained under pressure and was it not yet possible to implement such a system. Even the recent recommendation by the Board's Research Advisory Committee to budget for a 0.35% allocation in 1996/97 did not seem possible. In other words, in the short term it did not seem possible to accommodate on an *ad hoc* basis requests for funding of research. For the immediate future, it would seem the current system for requesting funding via the Board's Production Advisory Committee, for eventual evaluation, approval and recommendation by the Planning Committee for the Wool Industry and the Board's Research Advisory Committee, was the appropriate route to go. However, Mr. Kemp may liaise with Mr. Johan du Plessis of the office if more information regarding the existing procedures was required.

In a fax message dated 16 April 1996[707] to Mrs. Bonita Francis (Operations Assistant: NWGA), Mr. Schalk Cloete (Department of Agriculture, Western Cape: Sub directorate Animal Production, Elsenburg) referred to the faxed message of 3 April 1996 regarding 'Problem Animals' and wrote:

- The topic of problem animals was currently not included in the curriculum of Elsenburg. However, Mr. J.C. Engelbrecht would like to receive more information [contact detail provided]. It would be possible to provide a member of the committee opportunity to contribute to the course and present a few classes on the subject. (Handwritten note on the fax: I was also informed that they were not in favour of controlling problem animals. The Dohne Breeders Association lectured the students on their activities, policies, etc. The Committee was welcome to do the same.)

In a faxed letter dated 24 April 1996[708] to Mrs. Bonita Francis (NWGA, Port Elizabeth), Mr. G. van N du Toit (Glen College of Agriculture, Glen) referred to 'Problem Animals' and wrote:

- Reference was made to the fax of 3 April 1996 that was only received the previous day.
- Attached was an extract from the curriculum showing that a course in problem animals was presented. The Glen College of Agriculture in cooperation with Nature Conservation presented the course. The course was presented in the 1st Year of the Certificate Course. In the Diploma Course, no training was provided on problem animal control.
- He could be contacted for more information.

[706] File South African Wool Board: NWKV/Corresp/Navors.
[707] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.
[708] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.

Version 5.0 - Hoede Weal - Version 5.0

Glen College of Agriculture - 1st Year of the Certificate Course

p 8 - **Sheep dog training**

Time allotted: 6 periods of 2 h each.

Aim: To teach the student the basic principles of sheep dog training.

Content: Care and training of young dogs and the use of dogs in handling of animals.

Evaluation: Only demonstration (No contribution to Small Livestock total).

p 9 – **Problem animal control**

Time allotted: 9 periods of 2 h each.

Aim: To enable the student to control problem animals effectively, without harming the nature (ecology).

Content: Ecology, foothold traps, poison ejectors, cage traps and modern sound equipment.

Evaluation: One theoretical test and continuous practical evaluation (10% of Small Livestock total).

In a letter dated 25 April 1996[709] to the NWGA: Cape Province Branch (Port Elizabeth), Mr. J.A. Bekker (Chairperson: Steynsburg Farmers Union, Steynsburg) referred to 'Vermin Problem' and wrote:

- Because of the huge losses caused by black-backed jackal and caracal, small livestock farming in that region was seriously threatened. A survey by the local Farmers Union showed that predation losses exceeded losses by livestock theft by more than 300%.
- The problem became so serious that many farmers changed to cattle farming. In view of the implications for the already declining Merino industry, it was requested the matter be taken up through the vermin committee[710] of the NWGA with Nature Conservation.
- It was alleged that black-backed jackal and caracal were abundant in the Nature Reserves, especially in Oviston and Tussen-die-Riviere. It was suggested that representations be made to the Heads of the OFS and Cape Nature Conservation to reduce the numbers in the reserves to acceptable levels because it served as breeding site for the vermin.
- It was suggested that the RSC and Nature Conservation should consider the training of non-white hunters.
- A response on the matter would be appreciated.

In a letter dated 27 April 1996[711] to the Mr. Theuns Botha (Manager: NWGA), Mr. Albert (A.A.) van Rijswijk (Burgersdorp) referred to 'Vermin' and wrote:

- At the recent meeting on 17 April 1996 (at 14:30) at Steynsburg, Region 12 gave in depth attention to the damage caused by vermin (black-backed jackals, caracals and bat-eared foxes[712]) to their livestock industry.
- It was brought to the attention that many of the vermin were breeding on Nature Reserves in the area. The policy of Nature Conservation not to kill animals should be changed to reduce the numbers on Nature Conservation areas, before small livestock farmers could see their local control efforts bearing any fruit.
- Compared to the numbers lost from the lamb crops by vermin (50, 100 to 200 lambs per producer), losses from the other main enemy, livestock theft was trivial.
- It was requested that the matter be taken up through the Vermin Committee of the NWGA. Considering that the salaries of Nature Conservators must be paid from the profits in

[709] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.
[710] Editor's Note: Interestingly farmers were still colloquially referring in this way to the NPAPC.
[711] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.
[712] Editor's Note: it may have been an erroneous reference to bat-eared foxes (*Otocyon megalotis*) instead of Cape foxes (*Vulpes chama*).

Versions 5.0 - HO ce Wildl - Version 5.0

the nature conservation area, it would also benefit Nature Conservation to reduce vermin numbers and have more game to sell and manage the reserve profitable.

- Farmers took the control of vermin very serious, but it also was an expensive activity when considering the financial input for poison ejectors, poison collars and foothold traps. Therefore, they also requested assistance with the cost of controlling the animals.
- They also addressed a letter to the senior nature conservator in Venterstad and included a copy of the current letter.
- It was trusted this matter would be dealt with at a high level.

In a letter dated 15 May 1996[713] to Mr. J.A. Bekker (Chairperson: Steynsburg Farmers Union, Steynsburg), Mr. K.A. van Tonder (Secretary: NPAPC) referred to 'Vermin' and wrote:

- Receipt of the letter dated 25 April 1996 regarding vermin was acknowledged.
- The letter was placed on the Agenda of the NPAPC's meeting that was scheduled for 29 May 1996.
- Following that meeting, feedback would be given on the steps recommended by the Committee.

In a letter dated 15 May 1996[714] to Mr. A.A. van Rijswijk (Burgersdorp), Mr. K.A. van Tonder (Secretary: NPAPC) referred to 'Vermin' and wrote:

- Receipt of the letter dated 27 April 1996 regarding vermin was acknowledged.
- The letter was placed on the Agenda of the NPAPC's meeting that was scheduled for 29 May 1996.
- Following that meeting, feedback would be given on the steps recommended by the Committee.

In a letter dated 11 June 1996[715] to Mr. J.A. Bekker (Chairperson: Steynsburg NWGA District Executive, Steynsburg), Mr. K.A. van Tonder (Secretary: NPAPC) referred to 'Vermin Problem' and wrote:

- Reference was made to the previous letter.
- The problem was discussed at the recent meeting of NPAPC on 29 May 1996.
- Mr. J.J. Blom, the official responsible for both Oviston and Tussen-die-Riviere Nature Reserves, was present at the meeting. He undertook to investigate the matter and engage with the relevant Farmers Unions to solve the problem.
- It would seem that certain climatic conditions were responsible for the escalation in vermin numbers and that it was of a cyclical nature.
- Nevertheless, the problem was given attention.

In a letter dated 11 June 1996[716] to Mr. A.A. van Rijswijk (Burgersdorp), Mr. K.A. van Tonder (Secretary: NPAPC) referred to 'Vermin Problem' and wrote:

- Reference was made to the previous letter.
- The problem was discussed at the recent meeting of NPAPC on 29 May 1996.
- Mr. J.J. Blom, the official responsible for both Oviston and Tussen-die-Riviere Nature Reserves, was present at the meeting. He undertook to investigate the matter and engage with the relevant Farmers Unions to solve the problem.
- It would seem that certain climatic conditions were responsible for the escalation in vermin numbers and that it was of a cyclical nature.
- Nevertheless, the problem was given attention.

[713] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.
[714] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.
[715] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.
[716] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

Mr. Johan Strydom published an article on the Fox Buster[717], his new design of a poison ejector to control predating black-backed jackals. Mr. Strydom was a specialist predator hunter from Warden in the eastern Free State Province. A complete Fox Buster set was sold for R1 570.00 and comprised 10 Fox Busters, special setting pliers, an instruction manual and 50 sodium cyanide cartridges. Interested persons were also invited to attend a two-day training course at an additional cost of R200.00.

Mr. Johan Strydom and his son Mr. Hendri Strydom, specialist predator hunters from Warden in the Free State Province, published a comprehensive training manual[718] on problem animal control in December 1996; the theoretical and practical information was used during several training courses of farmers and predator hunters. The training manual dealt in detail with personal experiences in managing predation by a number of important damage-causing animals, namely black-backed jackals, caracals, brown hyaenas, vagrant dogs, baboons and leopards. Case studies were also provided on predation by servals, Cape foxes and African wildcats and how it was approached and solved.

In the training manual, Messrs. Strydom included an article from the Landbouweekblad of 19 July 1992, citing the following information:

> "*Mr. Johan Eyssen, the Liaison Officer of Oranjejag, the central hunt society in the Free State that hunted damage-causing animals in an organised manner, reported that during the period April 1991 to March 1992 the following animals were killed: 1 958 Cape foxes, 1 452 black-backed jackals, 233 caracals, 112 African wildcat, 1 brown hyaena and 137 vagrant dogs. Furthermore, during the same period members of Oranjejag reported the following losses: 13 300 lambs, 2 984 adult sheep, 17 calves, 43 Angora goat kids, 42 adult Angora goats, 82 Boerbok kids, 10 adult Boerbok goats, 73 springbok, 50 blesbok, 5 Grey rhebok, 54 ostriches, 3 waterbuck, 1 eland calf, 13 impala and 1 steenbok – altogether 16 878 animals. Black-backed jackals and caracals killed most animals. Since its founding in 1966, hunters of Oranjejag have killed 3 377 caracals, 24 589 black-backed jackals, 65 415 Cape foxes, 4 892 African wildcats, 2 945 vagrant dogs and 56 brown hyaenas.*"

In letters dated 28 August 1996[719] to Mr. D. Heard (Divisional Manager: Cape Nature Conservation, Western Cape, Cape Town), Mr. B. Basson (Eastern Cape Nature Conservation, Graaff-Reinet), Dr. D.J. Brand (Assistant Director: Northern Cape Nature Conservation, Kimberley), Mr. J.J. Blom (Agriculture and Environmental Affairs, Bloemfontein), Mr. M.J. de Wet (Nature Conservator, SA Lombard Nature Reserve – North West, Bloemhof), Mr. R. Physick (Deputy Director: West, Natal Parks Board, Pietermaritzburg), Mr. B. Curlewis (Nature Conservator, Gauteng Nature Conservation, Marble Hall), Mr. S. Wolff (Deputy Chief Executive Officer: Mpumalanga Parks Board, Nelspruit) and Mr. D. Celliers (Environmental Affairs and Tourism, Northern TPA, Pietersburg), Mr. Kevin (K.A.) van Tonder (Secretary: NPAPC) referred to 'Problem Animal Committee: Letters of Support from Provincial MEC's' and wrote:

> "*I refer to the above matter and the recent National Problem Animal Policy Committee meeting recently held in Kimberley.*
>
> *At this meeting a decision was taken that the representatives of the various provinces would obtain a letter of support from the MEC's responsible for problem animal control and that these letters are to be forwarded to the office of the Secretariat in due course.*

[717] Faan Martin, 1996. Suid-Afrika se jakkalskoning neem die voortou. 6 September 1996.
[718] Johan & Hendri Strydom. Probleemdierbeheer Kursus, aangebied deur Johan & Hendri Strydom. Desember 1996. 72 pp.
[719] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.

Version 5.0 - Historical Version 5.0

Furthermore, representatives from KwaZulu-Natal, Gauteng, North West and Northern Provinces undertook to forward the names of contact persons in these provinces to the Secretariat so that official lines of communication can be established in these provinces.

Your assistance in this regard will be appreciated."

In a letter 28 August 1996[720] to Mr. J.J. Blom (Department of Agriculture and Environmental Affairs, Bloemfontein), Mr. K.A. van Tonder (Secretary: NPAPC) referred to 'Oviston and Tussen-die-Riviere Nature Reserves' and wrote:

"*I refer to the above and the recent National Animal Problem Policy Committee meeting held in Kimberley.*

At this meeting you indicated that the complaints of the farmers surrounding the Oviston and Tussen-die-Riviere Nature Reserves regarding the lynx[721] problem, would be investigated.

I should be pleased if you could report on any actions taken in this regard so that I can report back to the various farmer associations in those regions."

In a letter 28 August 1996[722] to Mr. M.J. de Wet (Nature Conservator, SA Lombard Nature Reserve – North West, Bloemhof), Mr. K.A. van Tonder (Secretary: NPAPC) referred to 'Article on Lynx: Lucius Moolman' and wrote:

"*I refer to the above matter and the recent Problem Animal Policy Committee meeting held in Kimberley.*

You indicated that you had a copy of Lucius Moolman's article on lynx which would be forwarded to our office.

I would appreciate it if this article could be forwarded to our offices at your earliest convenience."

In a fax dated 8 October 1996[723] to Mr. Jannie Kemp (NWGA), Mr. Kevin (K.A.) van Tonder (Secretary: NPAPC) referred to the Policy and Strategy: Problem Animal Policy Committee and wrote:

- He conferred that morning with Dr. Dirk Brand regarding the Committee's Policy Document because Dr. Brand was going to make a submission to his MEC's.
- It seems the composition of the Committee, as stated in the Policy Document (see attached page), is outdated specifically regarding (a) four (4) provincial nature conservation authorities (it was already changed to nine), (b) Association of RSCs – apparently they do not exist anymore, and (c) Oranjejag does not exist anymore and the representation by Messrs J.C. Strydom and F.J. du Toit (problem animal hunters) in their private capacity, does not comply with the aims of the Policy Document.
- It would be appreciated to receive suggestions to address the problem. At the previous meeting, the Committee resolved that Messrs Jannie Kemp, Dirk Brand and P.F. Hugo might coordinate to address challenges such as these.
- Input would be appreciated.

In a letter dated 8 October 1996[724] to the Chief Executive Officers, Mr. J.H. Koen (Northern Cape Nature Conservation, Provincial Government of the Northern Cape) distributed a document 'Guidelines: Translocation and Rehabilitation of Problem Animals' for comments:

- The lack of guidelines on the translocation and rehabilitation of problem animals was identified as a potential problem during the meeting of the Interprovincial Problem Animal

[720] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.
[721] Editor's Note: many still referred to caracal as lynx.
[722] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.
[723] File WK 40 (b), NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee, Strategiese Plan.
[724] File NNO 9/25 files on File 40 (b), NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee, Strategiese Plan.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

Damage Control Committee (IPADCC) on 27 March 1996. As a result, the attached discussion document was drafted with the help of members of the committee.

- The document should not be seen as official policy of any of the participating organisations but is merely a discussion document that can assist in the formulation of future policy. Some of the issues could be sensitive and it is requested that members of the IPADCC obtain comments from their respective organisations for discussion at the next meeting in May 1997.

In letters dated 28 October 1996[725] to Mr. J.C. Strydom (Warden) and Mr. F.J. du Toit (Smithfield), Mr. Kevin (K.A.) van Tonder (Secretary: NPAPC) referred to the NPAPC and wrote:

- Specific reference was made to the Policy Document of the Committee.
- Regarding the composition of the Committee, the Policy Document provide for representatives of organisations and among others Oranjejag and the Federal Problem Animal Control Association. The document does not provide for individual members.
- Oranjejag does not exist anymore and challenges are foreseen with them as individual members of the Committee. Obviously, the Committee wants to retain their expertise and, therefore, the Chairperson requested that problem animal hunters must consider establishing an association that can be represented on the Committee.
- Input would be appreciated.

In a letter dated 30 October 1996[726] to Dr. D.J. Brand (Northern Cape Nature Conservation Services), Mr. Kevin (K.A.) van Tonder (Secretary: NPAPC) referred to the inquiry regarding the date on which the NPAPC was founded and wrote:

- The Committee was founded long before he became involved, therefore he must rely on the records on files and memory of the first Secretary of the Committee.
- It seems that January 1988 is the official date on which the Committee was founded. Before that date, it was only a Sub-committee of the NWGA that was involved with problem animal issues. The Sub-committee did not have national status.
- No records existed which showed the existence of a NPAPC prior to January 1988, but it may be possible that the file was incomplete although it was only speculation.
- Mr. Jannie Kemp will return from Australia the coming Friday[727] and the Policy Document will be discussed with him. Mr. Kemp and Mr. Hugo have already spoken in this regard.
- He offered to render Dr. Brand assistance should he require anything else.

In letters dated 6 November 1996[728] to Mr. Jannie Kemp (NWGA) and Dr. D.J. Brand (Northern Cape Nature Conservation Services), Mr. Kevin (K.A.) van Tonder (Secretary: NPAPC) referred to the NPAPC and wrote:

- Mr. J.C. Strydom (problem animal hunter) was contacted by telephone regarding their representation on the Committee.
- Mr. Strydom (Secretary) and Mr. du Toit (Chairperson) founded the Free State Problem Animal Hunters Association in October 1993. Therefore, it seems that they were representing an organisation on the Committee and not as individuals.
- It was suggested that this Association instead of Oranjejag amend the Policy Document to allow representation.
- Input would be appreciated.

[725] File WK 40 (b), NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee, Strategiese Plan.
[726] File WK 40 (b), NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee, Strategiese Plan.
[727] Editor's Note: it was Friday 1 November 1996.
[728] File WK 40 (b), NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee, Strategiese Plan.

Version 5.0 - NO OFFICIAL - Version 5.0

In a letter dated 20 November 1996[729] to the Head: Eastern Cape Nature Conservation (Amalinda), Mr. P. Schutte (Secretary: Venterstad Farmers Association, Venterstad) referred to 'Vermin in Reserves' and wrote:

- On behalf of the Venterstad Farmers Association the matter regarding vermin in the Oviston Nature Reserve was urgently conveyed by letter was. The letter referred to their meeting, which was held on 8 October 1996.
- The following was brought to the attention of the meeting:
  1. Farmers adjacent to the reserve were experiencing real problems by black-backed jackals from the reserve's land.
  2. Reserves where such big problems were experienced should be provided with hunt hound packs to continuously keep the vermin at an acceptable level.
  3. Fences must be kept in good order and at some places, the height of the fences should be increased.
  4. Farmers who are encountering problems should be allowed to engage black-backed jackals and follow them in hot pursuit into the reserves.
- It would be appreciated it the requests of the meeting be conveyed to the relevant authorities for approval and provide feedback regarding the decisions.
- The following persons [contact detail provided] were nominated to keep contact between the Venterstad Farmers' Association and the Eastern Cape Nature Conservation:
  Convenor: M. van der Walt, W. Botha, J. van den Heever and C. Collett.
- It was trusted and hoped that a solution for the matter would soon be forthcoming. If there were any questions, they could be contacted.

In a letter dated 26 November 1996[730] to Mr. J.J. Blom (Department of Agriculture and Environmental Affairs, Free State Province, Bloemfontein), Mr. K.A. van Tonder (Secretary: NPAPC) referred to 'Problem Animals' and wrote:

- Herewith a letter received from the Venterstad Farmers Association for information.
- Information was requested on the actions taken to address the problem.

In a letter dated 26 November 1996[731] to Mr. P. Schutte (Secretary: Venterstad Farmers Association), Mr. K.A. van Tonder (Secretary: NPAPC) referred to 'Vermin: Oviston Nature Reserve' and wrote:

- Reference was made to the above and said Oviston Nature Reserve was aware of the problem in the reserve.
- They have attended the recent meeting of the NPAPC where the problem was discussed and they gave and assurance that they would find a solution for the problem
- The NPAPC was monitoring the situation.

In a letter dated 26 November 1996[732] to the Secretary: NPAPC (Attention: Mr. K.A. van Tonder), Mr. J.J. Blom (Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism, Bloemfontein) referred to 'Investigation on Problem Animal Complaints: Tussen die Riviere Nature Reserve, District Bethulie' and wrote:

1. Reference was made to the letter dated 28 August 1996 regarding this matter.
2. In September 1996, the complaints of farmers, bordering on the Tussen-die-Riviere Nature Reserve, were investigated. Following the investigation, the following information and comments were provided:

[729] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.
[730] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.
[731] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.
[732] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

2.1 The area resorting under the Rouxville District Farmers Union, bordering on the relevant nature reserve was investigated. The Rouxville District Farmers' Union used the services of three private problem animal hunters, namely Messrs. F. du Toit, T. Fouche and J Swanepoel. An amount of R5 000.00 was annually paid to two of the hunters.

2.2 Ten farmers were visited. Information cover the period Aug. '95 to Sep. '96:

- 1 215 small livestock were killed by problem animals. A total of 51 black-backed jackals and 30 caracals were caught. An average of 15 small livestock/problem animal was killed.
- 70% of the farmers were trained in problem animal control. 90% of the farmers were members of a hunt club.
- Livestock losses could in many cases not substantiated and in some cases, losses were given from memory.
- 50% of farmers were not aware that problem animal control was conducted in the relevant nature reserve.
- Problem animal hunter Mr. F. du Toit said that farmers adjacent to the relevant nature reserve complained with him that black-backed jackal and caracal might be originating from the reserve.

3. Annually, the officials at Tussen die Riviere Nature Reserve conducted problem animal control. The methods included hunt hounds, which were stationed on the nature reserve, calling apparatus, foothold traps and poison ejectors. During the period December 1995 to March 1996, the following animals were killed: 26 black-backed jackals and 16 caracals.

4. The Free State Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism was doing the utmost to control the problem that was partly attributed to the nature reserve. However, it should be noted that problem animals were not only present on the nature reserve but anywhere where suitable habitats and food sources were available.

5. The Department was committed to address the problem, in close cooperation with the relevant farmers, and assist with the training of farmers/farm workers where there was a need.

6. An inquiry was also made about the Oviston Nature Reserve, which was under the jurisdiction of the Eastern Cape Nature Conservation. It was trusted they would also respond in due course to the inquiry.

In a letter dated 27 December 1996[733] to the Secretary (NPAPC), Mr. J.J. Blom (Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism, Bloemfontein) referred to 'Problem Animals: Oviston Nature Reserve' and wrote:

- Reference was made to the letter dated 26 November 1996.
- The Oviston Nature Reserve was under the jurisdiction of the Eastern Cape Nature Conservation, therefore the letter and attached correspondence were referred.

1997

In a letter dated 12 November 1997[734] to Mrs. B.E. Molewa (MEC: Tourism and Environment, North West Province, Mmabatho), Mr. Kevin van Tonder (Secretary: NPAPC) referred to 'Support: National Problem Animal Policy Committee' and wrote:

'*The National Problem Animal Policy Committee (NPAPC) is a national committee comprising of representatives from nature conservations, the National Woolgrowers Association of South Africa (NWGA), the Red Meat Producer Organisation and problem animal hunters.*

Over the past year, the NPAPC has been attempting to gain support for its Policy Document in which the aims of the NPAPC are set out.

[733] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.
[734] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.

Version 5.0 - HOOF Wad - Version 5.0

Small stock farms in South Africa suffer huge financial losses annually due to problem animals, the loss probably equal to that as a result of stock theft. This is therefore a problem that has financial implications for individual farmers, communities that work on farms as well as the economy of South Africa.

Wool production for example is one of the biggest foreign exchange earners for the South African economy and a solution to the problem animal 'epidemic' has to be found if South Africa still values the importance of earning foreign exchange.

Numerous provinces have already offered their support for the NPAPC but as yet, no reply has been received from your offices.

Kindly find attached hereto, the NPAPC Policy Document for your perusal. Should you have any queries regarding the NPAPC, you are welcome to contact me [detail] during office hours.

Your urgent attention hereto will be appreciated.'

1998

In a letter dated 7 January 1998[735] to Mr. Enoch Gondongwana (Minister of Economic Affairs, Environmental Affairs and Tourism, Eastern Cape Legislature, Bisho), Mr. Kevin van Tonder (Secretary: NPAPC) referred to 'Support: National Problem Animal Policy Committee' and wrote:

'*The National Problem Animal Policy Committee (NPAPC) is a national committee comprising of representatives from nature conservations, the National Woolgrowers Association of South Africa (NWGA), the Red Meat Producer Organisation and problem animal hunters.*

Over the past year, the NPAPC has been attempting to gain support for its Policy Document in which the aims of the NPAPC are set out.

Small stock farms in South Africa suffer huge financial losses annually due to problem animals, the loss probably equal to that as a result of stock theft. This is therefore a problem that has financial implications for individual farmers, communities that work on farms as well as the economy of South Africa.

Wool production for example is one of the biggest foreign exchange earners for the South African economy and a solution to the problem animal 'epidemic' has to be found if South Africa still values the importance of earning foreign exchange.

Numerous provinces have already offered their support for the NPAPC but as yet, no reply has been received from your offices.

Kindly find attached hereto, the NPAPC Policy Document for your perusal. Should you have any queries regarding the NPAPC, you are welcome to contact me [detail] during office hours.

Your urgent attention hereto will be appreciated.'

In a faxed letter dated 13 August 1998[736] to Mrs. Bonita Francis (Secretary: NPAPC), Mr. J.J.M. Coetzee (Chief Executive Officer: Representative Transitional Councils of the Western Cape Province) referred to 'Representation on the National Problem Animal Policy Committee' and wrote:

1. Reference was made to the circular dated 4 August 1997, as well as the telephone conversation between Mrs. Francis and Mrs. Bester of the Council regarding Mr. P.F. Hugo's attendance of the Committee's meeting on 10 September 1997.
2. As she was aware, Mr. P.F. Hugo was the representative of the Association of RSCs of South Africa that was disbanded a while ago and replaced by a new national body on which district councils and local transitional councils were accommodated.
3. It was noted that the Committee had reflected on the future of the NPAPC on 29 May 1996 in Kimberley. If indeed it was decided that the Committee would continue its activities,

[735] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.
[736] File 13/1 Representative Transitional Councils of the Western Cape Province. Enquiries: Mr. E.F.C. Beukes.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

and since the function regarding problem animal control was provided in the rural areas, she wanted to highlight an important aspect. The representative transitional councils were established with the authority to represent the inhabitants of a region regarding matters that pertained to rural local governance.

4. However, if it was important that a representative from the Western Cape should be accommodated on the Problem Animal Policy Committee, she was made aware of the recently established Western Cape Provincial Association of Representative Transitional Councils that may be of assistance [contact detail provided]. Apparently, the other Provinces did not have similar associations.

In letters dated 13 August 1998[737] to Mrs. M.E. Olckers (MEC: Environmental Affairs & Culture, Western CPA, Cape Town), Mr. E. Gondongwana (MEC: Economic Affairs, Environmental Affairs & Tourism, Bisho), Mr. Thabo S. Makweya (MEC: Agriculture and Nature Conservation, Northern Cape Provincial Government, Kimberley), Mr. P.H.I Makgoe (MEC: Environmental Affairs & Tourism, Bloemfontein), Inkosi N.J. Ngubane (MEC: Traditional & Environmental Affairs, KwaZulu-Natal Provincial Government, Ulundi), Mr. A.F. Mahlalela (MEC: Environmental Affairs & Tourism, Mpumalanga Provincial Government, Nelspruit), Ms. Nomvula Mokonyane (MEC: Agriculture, Conservation and Environment, Gauteng Provincial Government, Johannesburg) and Dr. Dean T. Farisani (MEC: Agriculture, Land & Environmental Affairs, Northern Provincial Government, Pietersburg), Mrs. Bonita Francis (Secretary: NPAPC) referred to 'National Problem Animal Policy Committee Meeting' and wrote:

"*As one of the most important role players on this Committee, yourself or a representative from your Department, are herewith invited to attend the annual meeting of the National Problem Policy Committee (NPAPC) to be held from* ***7-9 September 1998 at the Jonkershoek Nature Conservation Station, Stellenbosch****.*

Statement of intent

The NPAPC is a liaison and co-ordinating forum to combine the power and expertise of Government and agricultural interest groups to effectively reduce the losses caused by problem animals by means of ecologically and ethically acceptable methods.

Composition of Committee

1. Each of the producer organisations which are effected by problem animals;
2. The South African Agricultural Union;
3. Larger problem animal control organisations, namely the Free State Problem animal Hunters Assoc. and the Federal Problem animal Control Assoc.;
4. The Association of District Councils as representative of district councils who undertake problem animal control;
5. The Member of Executive Council of each province responsible for nature conservation;
6. The nine provincial nature conservation authorities.

The future of this Committee was discussed during a meeting in May 1996 and it was apparent that everybody present felt that the Committee had a role to play. A very important factor with regard to direct access to the offices of the provincial MEC's was raised and those present were instructed to liaise directly with their respective MEC's and that they receive mandates from the highest level regarding problem animal control.

It was further decided that letters be addressed to all the provincial MEC's responsible for problem animals, requesting them to express support towards the operations of the NPAPC.

[737] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.

Version 5.0 – Final Draft Version 5.0

Letters of support were received from the Northern Cape, Western Cape, Northern Province, the Free State and KwaZulu-Natal.

Program of events

Monday, 7 September 1998

- *Members arrive in Stellenbosch*
- *Welcome Dinner at the Spier Estate near Stellenbosch*

Tuesday. 8 September 1998

08:00 - Committee meeting
13:00 - Lunch
14:00 - Continuation of meeting
17:00 - Gathering of Inter Provincial Committees (you are not involved)

- *Some of the members return home, otherwise the next morning*

Accommodation

Block bookings have been made at certain guest houses.

Flight particulars

I trust that the following particulars will make the task of bookings flights, much easier: Monday, 7 September 1998 and Wednesday, 9 September 1998 [detail of return flights for Cape Town, Port Elizabeth, Johannesburg, Bloemfontein and Durban were provided].

I would appreciate it if you could let me know as soon as possible if yourself or a representative will be attending."

In a letter dated 17 August 1998[738] to The Private Secretary of the MEC: Economic Affairs, Environmental Affairs & Tourism, Eastern Cape Provincial Government), Mrs. Bonita Francis (Secretary: NPAPC) referred to 'Support: National Problem Animal Policy Committee' and wrote:

"*I attach hereto a self explanatory letter dated 7 January 1998 with regards to the above.*

An invitation was also addressed to the MEC to attend the meeting of the National Problem Animal Policy Committee on 8 September 1998 – the said invitation was faxed to your office on Friday, 14 August 1998.

Your urgent attention to the above would be appreciated."

In a fax message dated 17 August 1998[739] to The Private Secretary (Mr. Govender for the MEC: Tourism and Environment, North West Province, Mmabatho), Mrs. Bonita Francis (Secretary: NPAPC) referred to 'Support: National Problem Animal Policy Committee' and wrote:

"*I attach hereto a self explanatory letter dated 12 November 1997 with regards to the above.*

An invitation to the MEC to attend the meeting of the National Problem Animal Policy Committee on 8 September 1998 is also attached.

Your urgent attention to the above would be appreciated."

On 17 August 1998[740], Mrs. Bonita Francis (Secretary: NPAPC) send a previous letter dated 13 August 1998 (addressed to other MEC's) to Mrs. B.E. Molewa (MEC: Tourism and Environment, North West Province Government, Mmabatho). The letter to the MEC's referred to 'National Problem Animal Policy Committee Meeting'.

[738] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.
[739] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.
[740] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

In a fax dated 18 August 1998[741] to Mrs. Bonita Francis (Secretary: NPAPC), Mr. J.H. Koen (Northern Cape Nature Conservation, Provincial Government of the Northern Cape) provided at Mrs. Francis's request a copy of a letter dated 8 October 1996[742] which was send to the Chief Executive Officers with an attached document 'Guidelines: Translocation and Rehabilitation of Problem Animals.' The original letter briefly stated:

- The lack of guidelines on the translocation and rehabilitation of problem animals was identified as a potential problem during the meeting of the Interprovincial Problem Animal Damage Control Committee (IPADCC) on 27 March 1996. As a result, the attached discussion document was drafted with the help of members of the committee.
- The document should not be seen as official policy of any participating organisation, but was merely a discussion document that can assist in the formulation of future policy. Some of the issues could be sensitive and it is requested that members of the IPADCC obtain comments from their respective organisations for discussion at the next meeting in May 1997.

In a letter dated 24 August 1998[743] to Secretary: NPAPC (Port Elizabeth), Mr. N.S. Mbokazi (Administrative Secretary: Ministry for Traditional and Environmental Affairs and of Safety and Security, Ulundi) referred to 'NPAPC Meeting' and wrote:

"*Your letter dated 13 August on the above is acknowledged with thanks.*

Kindly be advised that the matter has been referred to Dr. G. Hughes the Acting Chief Executive of KwaZulu-Natal Nature Conservation Services. He can be contacted in [detail] Pietermaritzburg."

In a letter dated 29 September 1998[744] to Mr. Enoch Gondongwana (MEC: Economic Affairs, Environment and Tourism, Bisho), Mrs. Bonita Francis (Secretary: NPAPC) referred to 'Support: National Problem Animal Policy Committee' and wrote:

"*The National Problem Animal Policy Committee (NPAPC) is a national committee comprising of representatives from nature conservations, the National Woolgrowers Association of South Africa (NWGA), the Red Meat Producer Organisation and problem animal hunters.*

Over the past year, the NPAPC has been attempting to gain support for its Policy Document in which the aims of the NPAPC are set out.

Small stock farms in South Africa suffer huge financial losses annually due to problem animals, the loss probably equal to that as a result of stock theft. This is therefore a problem that has financial implications for individual farmers, communities that work on farms as well as the economy of South Africa.

Wool production for example is one of the biggest foreign exchange earners for the South African economy and a solution to the problem animal 'epidemic' has to be found if South Africa still values the importance of earning foreign exchange.

Numerous provinces have already offered their support for the NPAPC but as yet, no reply has been received from your offices.

Kindly find attached hereto, the NPAPC Policy Document for your perusal. Should you have any queries regarding the NPAPC, you are welcome to contact me [detail] during office hours.

Your urgent attention hereto will be appreciated." (Handwritten note by Bonita Francis on the letter: 1-10-98 – Letter posted to Jaap Pienaar – he undertook to hand it over personally.)

1999

[741] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.
[742] File NNO 9/25 on File 40 (b), NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee, Strategiese Plan.
[743] File TEA 2/5/4 Province of KwaZulu-Natal, Ulundi.
[744] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

In a letter dated 1 February 1999[745] to Mr. M.J. Latsky (Manager: BKB, Durban), Mrs. Bonita Francis (Operations Assistant: NWGA) submitted a request for Mpumalanga Problem Animal Control:

- He was reminded that the matter of funding for problem animal control was once again introduced at the 1999 Mpumalanga Annual Meeting.
- Mr. Kerneels Greyling (Chairperson: Federal Problem Animal Control Association) reported on some efforts to generate funds for effective problem animal control, but sufficient funds remained a challenge.
- During a visit to Mr. J.B. Masilela, Minister of Agriculture, he was very positive about the activities undertaken to control problem animals and said the contribution by government should be doubled
- The Mpumalanga Annual Congress was unanimous in putting a formal request to BKB for a 0.5% levy deduction on the gross yield of producer's wool. It would be a voluntary contribution with a reimbursement option for the producers. Another wool broker was already implementing such a system.
- The position of BKB was noted that the producer could only affect the deduction after receipt of a special letter of authorisation. Although Mpumalanga NWGA appreciate the position, the collection of said special letters of authorisation would be almost impossible.
- Against the unanimity among delegates at the Annual Meeting, Mpumalanga NWGA make a plea for BKB to reconsider its position especially since individual producers would have a reimbursement option.
- A speedy response was awaited.

In a letter dated 16 February 1999[746] to Mrs. Bonita Francis (Operations Assistant), Mr. D.C. Slabbert Greyling (Managing Director: BKB Limited, Port Elizabeth) acknowledged receipt of her letter dated 1 February 1999 regarding funding of Mpumalanga: Problem Animal Control:

- Regarding the formal request by the Mpumalanga Annual Congress to BKB for a 0.5% levy on the gross yield of producer's wool, the following:
  - Since August 1987, the position of BKB's Directors in this regard was put repeatedly to all stakeholders. This position remained.
  - **BKB would not make any deductions from the product-yields of producers unless it was authorised in writing by the producer.**
  - Any deviation would have legal ramifications for BKB from producers.
- The position of BKB in this regard was the only legal binding position that could be justified towards its shareholders and it was hoped that this position would be accepted.

In a letter dated 8 March 1999[747] to Mr. Kerneels Greyling (Chairperson: Federal Problem Animal Control Association, Wakkerstroom), Mrs. Bonita Francis (Operations Assistant) gave feedback regarding Funding: Mpumalanga Problem Animal Control:

- At the 1999 Mpumalanga Annual Meeting, those present were unanimous in requesting BKB to reconsider its decision that 0.5% would not be deducted from producer's wool yields without a written consent being given to the wool broker. The response by BKB was attached.
- It was important to maintain the service of problem animal control and the structures from ending. Therefore, Cape Wools SA supports the proposal by the Mpumalanga Congress that the NWGA would apply for funding of this function.

[745] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.
[746] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.
[747] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee.

Version 5.0 - Hoare Waal - Version 5.0

- The function was not part of the NWGA Producers Services and must be funded from the Wool Trust; therefore, the matter would have to serve as a discussion point at the forthcoming 1999 Central Annual Congress.
- It was trusted that was in order. Best wishes were extended for the sterling work done albeit with limited funding.

On 28 May 1999, the Landbouweekblad[748] carried an article 'CMW involved in struggle against problem animals':

"The plague of jackals, caracals, brown hyaenas and hyaenas were harassing livestock farmers in Mpumalanga and were now extending to the North-eastern Free State and parts of the Karoo. According to livestock farmers the problem was gaining epidemic proportions and was of greater concern than livestock theft.

Mr. Cornelius Greyling, a livestock farmer at Bovenvallei in the Wakkerstroom district and Chairperson of the Federal Problem Animal Association, said the problem stems from the fact that that Mpumalanga part of the Highveld, where livestock farming predominated, borders on the Kruger National Park and several private wildlife reserves. This was exacerbated by forestry in the area which are providing breeding areas for the vermin.

Clubs established. Previously, when farmers experienced problems with vermin, they could register a club comprising seven farmers and approach the authorities for assistance. Thus 14 separate clubs were established which covered a total area of 1 million ha. A levy of was imposed to which the government contributed 50%. The clubs were supported by the Directorate Nature Conservation to control the reduction of vermin.

He said vermin annually caused losses of about R4.5 million, although it may be double that amount. Even cows going down to calve are attacked. Although the new Constitution prohibits compulsory levies, the Minister of Agriculture pledged his support to the control project and said government's contribution would be doubled. The Directorate Nature Conservation would also contribute. Unfortunately government could not honour its pledge because of economic reasons.

Voluntary levy. At two consecutive Annual NWGA Congresses a unanimous plea was made to reintroduce the levy, but farmers had to hear repeatedly that the Constitution prohibits compulsory levies of any nature.

In desperation wool brokers was approached to support livestock farmers by means of a voluntary levy on wool. Mr. Klaas Kritzinger, Assistant General Manager of Cape Mohair & Wool (CMW), said CMW undertook to deduct 0.5% of the gross yield on all wool from the Mpumalanga area for vermin control. This deduction was voluntary. With the weigh in invoice farmers are notified that such a deduction was made and that it is refundable if the farmer is not in agreement. It was found that almost 100% of the producers supported the voluntary contribution."

On 28 May 1999, the Landbouweekblad[749] carried an article by Isabel Stolz 'Struggle against problem animals get financial aid':

"The animal feed manufacturer Voermol Feeds gave its financial support to the Federal Problem Animal Control Association (FPACA) after the association was forced to implement cost saving measures. As a result farmers considered using undesirable alternatives such as poisons and untrained hunt dogs to control problem animals.

The personnel of the FPACA was cut by 30% and its hunt hounds by 35% as a result of financial constraints when financial assistance fell away in the new dispensation.

Jackals, caracals and servals, as well as brown hyaenas, created big problems for especially small livestock farmers in Mpumalanga and were controlled effectively by trained

[748] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee. "CMW betrek in stryd teen probleemdiere" p 81.
[749] File WK 40, NWKV Probleemdierbeleidskomitee. "CMW betrek in stryd teen probleemdiere" p 87.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

hunters and hunt hounds under the management of the FPACA. Mr. Pierre Uys, executive member of the FPACA, said the financial support by Voermol would contribute to the continued existence of small livestock farming in Mpumalanga, as well as the protection of wildlife. If other organisations also wanted to contribute they could contact Mr. Uys."

2000

Mr. Peter Schneekluth, a renowned specialist predator hunter published an illustrated booklet[750] to teach people how to use different predator control equipment. During practical field courses, he shared the vast knowledge and experience in predation control with farmers, farmhands and predator hunters.

2002

The African Large Predator Research Unit (ALPRU) was founded on 13 February 2002 at the University of the Free State (UFS) by Mr. Sarel van der Merwe [Curator: Bloemfontein Zoological Gardens and a founding member/Chairman: African Lion Working Group (ALWG)] and Prof. HO de Waal [registered professional Animal Scientist (Animal Nutritionist) and a member of ALWG]. The UFS Executive Management officially recognised the founding of ALPRU on 4 March 2002[751].

2004

On 17 February 2004, Mr. Sarel van der Merwe and Prof. HO de Waal of ALPRU attended a meeting regarding Compound 1080, which was convened by the National Wool Growers' Association (NWGA) at the UFS. With a view to address the challenge of high predation losses, the NWGA, an important South African producers' organisation contemplated to incorporate Compound 1080 (sodium fluoroacetate) as a "dropper-hung-poisoned-bait". Except for general assumptions, very little substantiating information was actually available to justify the NGWA's proposed initiative. Therefore, ALPRU requested the NWGA for more background information and their proposed trial protocol. On 18 February 2004, Mr. Briers Bekker, on behalf of the NGWA kindly provided a faxed copy of the "1080 Trial Project Protocols", dated 4 February 2004.

In letters to the NWGA (dated 19 February 2004) and EWT (dated 23 March 2004), ALPRU noted its "*considerable trepidation regarding the recent efforts to try and incorporate Compound 1080 (sodium fluoroacetate) as a 'dropper-hung-poisoned-bait'*". ALPRU did not object to Compound 1080 *per se*, but the route in which the poison was administered ("*dropper-hung-poisoned-bait*") with very little control to prevent non-target animals and even people from being poisoned accidentally.

The shortfall in important information regarding predation in South Africa as expressed by ALPRU during the meeting on 17 February 2004 was later corroborated during interactions with more role players. It was obvious that predators were managed in a fragmented and uncoordinated way in South Africa; therefore, a coordinated approach was urgently needed to manage specifically black-backed jackals and caracals effectively and to reduce the impact of predation on the South African livestock industry.

The paucity of information regarding the negative impact of predation on the livestock industry was the primary catalyst for ALPRU to launch the Canis-Caracal Programme (CCP) on 10 December 2004; the name CCP was derived by joining the genus names for the black-backed jackal (*Canis*) and the caracal (*Caracal*). The founding members of the CCP were Dr. Nico

[750] Schneekluth, P., 2000. Predator control equipment and how to use it. Bowles Drukker, 2000. 18 pp.
[751] UFS Executive Management Meeting Minutes, paragraph 7.5, and subsection (b) (v).

Version 5.0 HO de Waal - Version 5.0

Avenant (National Museum, Bloemfontein), Mr. Sarel van der Merwe (Bloemfontein Zoological Gardens), Mr. Willie Combrinck (UFS) and Prof. HO de Waal (UFS).

The goal of the CCP was to boost efforts and resuscitate the dormant, or more aptly described non-existent, coordinated system of predator management in South Africa. The initiative by ALPRU to collect information on predation and its impact on livestock was widely publicised; thus, renewed awareness was created among livestock producers and authorities. ALPRU advocated that predators such as black-backed jackals and caracals must be viewed and managed as a national priority and that the two major role players must assume their respective responsibilities, namely:

- Government is responsible for policy, coordination, training, extension, research, and monitoring; however, they must refrain from dominating the scene, as they did in the past.
- Livestock farmers and wildlife ranchers are responsible to safeguard their animals and controlling predators; with appropriate assistance rendered by government.

On 10 December 2004, ALPRU sent letters of introduction regarding the CCP to key role players, namely the National Problem Animal Committee (NPAC), National Wool Growers' Association (NWGA), Endangered Wildlife Trust (EWT), National Emerging Red Meat Producers' Organisation (NERPO), Red Meat Producers' Organisation (RPO), Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism (DEAT) and the National Museum, Bloemfontein. The three objectives of the Canis-Caracal Programme (CCP) were set out in the letters to key role players:

"*1. Collate and interpret all available data and information on these two predator species.*

The current impasse on any real progress in controlling these two predator species and reducing their impact is partly due to the fragmented nature and unavailability of useful data and information. Therefore, a dedicated project will be launched to locate and collate all relevant data and information in this regard and have it strategically available at ALPRU, University of the Free State, Bloemfontein.

An important aspect will be to negotiate and arrange the necessary access to different sources of data and information, especially those in the custody of provincial and national authorities but also those held by private initiative.

It might be required to launch new dedicated studies to gather basic information.

2. Initiate, support and conduct scientific studies on the ecology of these two predator species and their food base.

Although these studies will focus primarily on biological aspects, it is also important to have a better understanding of relevant sociological aspects, as well as management practices used by farmers and other role players aimed at the control of problems caused by these two predator species.

3. Formulate new or update existing scientific-based management strategies to control these two predator species and relate it to provincial and national policies.

As a logical consequence of this initiative it is foreseen that major input will be made towards more comprehensive and uniform strategies and policies on the control of these two predator species in South Africa."

The Landmark Foundation, governed by a Charitable Trust Deed and registered with the Master of the High Court in Grahamstown, South Africa, was founded in 2004. The Landmark Foundation is also registered with the South African Department of Social Development as a Not-For-Profit organisation (NPO 039416) and with the South African Revenue Services.

2005

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

The National Forum for Damage Causing Animals met on 1 March 2005 in the boardroom of Senwes, Bloemfontein. Prof. HO de Waal made the first presentation[752] regarding the Canis-Caracal Programme (CCP) on behalf of ALPRU. The NWGA called for the meeting and stated that it was a continuation of activities previously performed by the NPAPC. The agenda included the following topics:

- Approval of the minutes of the meeting, which was held on 20 July 2004 in the Senwes building, Bloemfontein.
- Mr. Leon de Beer reported on progress with the National Problem Animal Manual – Mr. Hannes Stadler and Mr. Hannes Blom were tasked to update the manual. He undertook to provide a written progress report to the meeting.
- Mr. Willie van Zijl, Multipole Chemicals reported on the status and other relevant information regarding the 1080 pilot project.
- Prof. Gerhard Verdoorn enquired in a letter about the position of Agri SA regarding this issue (1080).
- Mr. Thys de Wet alluded to the development of a new poison as bait.
- Dr. Arno Moore reported on the progress with the "Analysis of predator elimination with respect to predator population dynamics and stock damage"; Mr. Rob Harrison-White submitted the project in 2003 for possible funding by Cape Wools SA.
- Dr. Arno Moore reported on a literature study regarding creative alternative control methods.
- Prof. HO de Waal made a presentation regarding the CCP, predator control and a system of coordinated predation management.
- Mr. Johan Strydom made a presentation on the manufacturing and marketing of the product called "Silent Killer"; it was a poison ejector akin to the coyote getter and an improvement on his previous, very successful model, the "Fox Buster."
- Mr. Thys de Wet alluded to a new practical-scientific approach to deal with problem animals.
- Mr. Eddie Steenkamp undertook to provide a progress report on a specific poison collar (PAL; Protect-a-Lamb) as predation control method.

The South African livestock farmers were represented by the three producers' organisations, namely the NWGA, RPO and South African Mohair Growers' Association (SAMGA). Since 2005, these organisations increasingly recognised the negative impact of predation on members and contributed moral and financial support towards the initiative to manage predation.

Separate to the initiative engaged in by the livestock farmers in predation management, the game farmers in several provinces (South African Game Ranchers' Organisation, SAGRO) were also involved in initiatives of DEAT, namely the envisaged regulation of hunting activities. However, the hunting activities would also involve control of two important mesopredators, namely the predating black-backed jackals and caracals on livestock farms. Seemingly, the two processes by DEAT were running parallel but with no obvious linking to prevent duplication.

In this regard also, refer to the launching of ALPRU's Canis-Caracal Programme (CCP) on 10 December 2004. This initiative was gaining momentum in its efforts to coordinate different groups with the same broad objectives, namely sheep, goat and cattle farmers and wildlife ranchers.

[752] De Waal, HO, Van der Merwe, Sarel & Combrinck, Willie, 2005. Canis-Caracal Programme. National Forum for Animal Damage Control. 1 March 2005. NWGA Board Room, Bloemfontein, South Africa.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

Since 2003, DEAT experienced external and internal pressure to regulate the hunting of captive bred lions (*Panthera leo*) in South Africa[753]. Resistance to DEAT's initial narrow view on lions only soon resulted in a broadening of the focus. On 28 January 2005, two draft documents were published on the sustainable use of large predators[754] and the keeping and hunting of large predators[755] in South Africa; written comments were invited by 15 March 2005. Prof. HO de Waal submitted ALPRU's input on 14 March 2005 and commended DEAT on this broadening of the initiative:

> *"We support this initiative to publish and invite public comments on the following documents.*
>
> *When the contents of these documents are adopted in a final format after public participation and applied as intended, it should provide unambiguous definitions and terminology and set clear guidelines to ensure uniformity in dealing with large predators.*
>
> *We respectfully suggest that the definition of large predators suggested by both the title and a short list of only six large predators species indigenous to South Africa (cheetah Acinonyx jubatus, spotted hyaena Crocuta crocuta, brown hyaena Hyaena brunnea, wild dog Lycaon pictus, lion Panthera leo, leopard P. pardus), is an oversight or a serious flaw. Unless the initiative pertains comprehensively to all larger South African predators, and for that matter also all larger African and alien larger predators, it will create serious loopholes that may not have been intended or foreseen. May we suggest that references to large or larger predators in this context refer to terrestrial species where the adult females do not usually weigh less than 10 kg; it should be substantiated by a comprehensive list of the large predator species."*

Public resistance to DEAT's hastily devised process to finalise the draft documents soon resulted in DEAT resorting to the appointment a Panel of Experts. The Terms of Reference of the Panel of Experts was very narrow and drew public comments requesting urgent revision. Left with few alternatives, DEAT obliged and informed stakeholders and role players on 31 May 2005 about the broadening of the Terms of Reference of the Panel of Experts. On 1 June 2005, ALPRU commended DEAT on taking this wise step:

> *"This step is welcomed by ALPRU, especially since it will now include more issues and species than the initial narrow view taken on only six large African predator species. We are also encouraged by the acknowledgement that the hunting industry is a "significant revenue generator for private game farms and for those communities that have access to and control over conservation area.*
>
> *We hope this initiative is the beginning of a strong and lasting partnership between the relevant government spheres and the various stakeholders and role players in South Africa to the mutual benefit of the country."*

DEAT invited interested and affected parties to make presentations at the Public Hearing for Panel of Experts on professional and recreational hunting, scheduled for 11 & 12 August 2005 at SANBI Environmental Education Centre, Pretoria. In a letter (dated 18 July 2005), Prof. HO de Waal (ALPRU/UFS) was invited to make a presentation at the Public Hearing. A double-booking was made for the venue, therefore the Public Hearing for the Panel of Experts on

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

[753] Government Gazette (Vol. 456) No. 25090 of 13 June 2003. Government Notices No. 874 - Publication of National Environmental Policies and Strategies, Appendix 2: National principles, norms and standards for the sustainable use of large predators in South Africa.

[754] Government Gazette No. 27214 of 28 January 2005. Draft National Norms and Standards for the sustainable use of large predators issued in terms of section 9(1) of the National Environmental Management: Biodiversity Act 2004 (Act No. 10 of 2004).

[755] Government Gazette No. 27214 of 28 January 2005. Draft regulations relating to the keeping and hunting of *Acinonyx jubatus*, *Hyaena brunnea*, *Crocuta crocuta*, *Lycaon pictus*, *Panthera leo* and *Panthera pardus*, in terms of section 97(1) of the National Environmental Management; Biodiversity Act, 2004 (Act No. 10 of 2004).

Professional and Recreational Hunting was, at short notice and with some breakdown in effective communication, relocated on 12 August 2005 to the St Georges Hotel, Irene.

In a letter to the Panel of Experts (dated 12 August 2005), Prof. HO de Waal provided background on the process and the underlying reasons for making the input:

> *"This submission is made against the background of two previous submissions (see attached documents), namely on 29 July 2003, regarding*
>
> - *Government Gazette (Vol. 456) No. 25090 of 13 June 2003 Government Notices No. 874 – Publication of National Environmental Policies and Strategies, Appendix 2: National principles, norms and standards for the sustainable use of large predators in South Africa*
>
> *and then on 14 March 2005, regarding*
>
> - *Government Gazette No. 27214 of 28 January 2005*
>
> *1. Draft National Norms and Standards for the sustainable use of large predators issued in terms of section 9(1) of the National Environmental Management: Biodiversity Act 2004 (Act No. 10 of 2004)*
>
> *2. Draft regulations relating to the keeping and hunting of Acinonyx jubatus, Hyaena brunnea, Crocuta crocuta, Lycaon pictus, Panthera leo and Panthera pardus, in terms of section 97(1) of the National Environmental Management; Biodiversity Act, 2004 (Act No. 10 of 2004)"*

In an oral presentation to the Panel of Experts on 12 August 2005 at St Georges Hotel, Irene, Gauteng Province, Prof. HO de Waal provided the following specific perspective:

> *"Wildlife ranching is a major role player in the wildlife industry of South Africa and contributes substantially to the national economy. However, because of fragmentation in nine provincial authorities, its real size and contribution are poorly quantified. This is not necessarily a result of the Constitutional arrangement, but rather lack of capacity and effective communication between authorities. Furthermore, the wildlife industry and in particular many activities pertaining to wildlife ranching is regulated with often antiquated provincial ordinances. The paucity of general and specific information regarding hunting clearly was an important consideration that prompted the Panel of Experts to decide that several key aspects should be addressed by the four commissioned research papers. However, many issues pertaining specifically to the wildlife ranching industry may not be dealt with adequately or even not at all by the current probe into hunting per se.*
>
> *Many wildlife ranches were developed from previous livestock farming enterprises; some are still neighbouring livestock farms. For the past few centuries livestock have been predated by large African predators. In recent times the black-backed jackal (Canis mesomelas) and the caracal (Caracal caracal) are annually causing huge losses among livestock, mainly small stock; the losses are estimated at several hundred million Rand. Several thousand specimens of these two wildlife species are exterminated annually in a myriad of ways (including being hunted with fire arms), but again the real extent of the problem and possible solutions is poorly quantified. Although these two predator species cause huge livestock losses, they are very important components of the South African ecology. There should not be any question of extermination, efforts which have proved to be ineffective for the black-backed jackal over the last three centuries, but rather means to reduce the impact of predation on the livestock industry. It is therefore inevitable that problem animal control (PAC) measures cannot be viewed in isolation or differently by provincial authorities, but PAC measures must form an integral part of the comprehensive review of the wildlife industry in close partnership with the livestock industry."*

Version 5.0 HO de Waal - Version 5.0

The following section was noted in the Panel of Expert's Report to the Minister[756]:

"*5.4 Damage-Causing Animals*

Damage Causing Animals (DCAs) are a serious problem for communities and farmers living adjacent to parks and wildlife production units. In places like Limpopo, the cross-border migration from Botswana and Zimbabwe of elephant, crocodiles and predators have compounded the problem. Provincial authorities have pointed out that human and wild animal interactions result because of poorly maintained fences, and the availability of increased game has led to the resurgence of predator activity, and sometimes resulting in attacks on livestock and people on farms and in communal areas.

The issue of DCAs has been left largely to provincial authorities and at present, there are inconsistencies in the way DCAs are dealt with by each province. The authority to deal with a DCA resides with the provincial MEC which can then be delegated to a specific official. Approaches vary from a system where the permission to capture or hunt a DCA can be put out to tender, or where a permit is granted to an owner whose property has been affected. Where an animal has wandered onto private land and has been hunted, the proceeds from the carcass sale, in some provinces, has been used by the owner as compensation and to fund activities such as mending fences. This is an issue that is in transition as several provinces have developed new policies aimed at ensuring that "problem animals" truly are damage-causing before they are hunted, requiring either a permit to hunt animals previously classified as "problem animals" or a determination by the province that the animal is indeed a "problem animal".

The Panel heard requests from the community representatives at the public hearing that they would like to manage certain types of DCAs themselves. They would like to engage government around a process to look at ways in which communities can manage problem animals on their land. As such systems would require specialised skills to ensure humane treatment and appropriate practices. The details of this proposition will have to be worked out between the affected role players.

Of concern to the Panel is the abuse of the provincial systems to manage DCAs whereby private operators seek DCA hunting permits under false pretences for those species of DCA that have high commercial value. It is these abuses that have led the Panel to the conclusion that the issue of DCAs must be totally separated from commercial hunting. The Panel strongly recommends that the issue of DCAs, which is a provincial wildlife management issue, be dealt with under a separate policy process, and that no DCA should be hunted or be dealt with through a commercial hunting agreement.

The Panel therefore welcomes the fact that the DEAT's Working Group 1 has approved the drafting of norms and standards for DCAs. The Panel's main contribution to those draft norms and standards is that in order to avoid abuse of the management of DCAs, government should solely be responsible for the management of DCAs and the right to hunt DCAs should not be given on concession. The Panel also supports the principle of exclusion, then capture and relocation and only as a last resort, should the DCA be destroyed."

The negative impact of livestock predation ascribed to black-backed jackals and caracals as well as management activities, including hunting to control these two mesopredators, were not addressed in the final report of the Panel of Experts.

On 24 December 2005[757] Mr. W.J. van der Westhuizen (Chairman: Vanrhynsdorp Problem Animal Control, Vanrhynsdorp, Lutzville, Western Cape) wrote (translation):

- Dear Landowner and Tenants (Livestock farmers)

[756] Final Draft. Report to the Minister of Environmental Affairs and Tourism: Panel of Experts on Professional and Recreational Hunting in South Africa. 25 October 2005.

[757] File CapeNature: Hunt Reports, Breërivier Regional Services Council.

Version 5.0 - PDF Web Version 5.0

- It was with grave unease regarding this matter that a few thoughts were shared and some information provided at this time of the year.
- Most were aware of the existence and functioning of the Urionskraal and Grootdrift Hunt Clubs, which received financial assistance for the control from the West Coast District Municipality. In September 2005, the final financial contribution was received.
- Previously the caracal and leopard were the biggest problem, but the black-backed jackal started appearing at an unexpected scale and already cause huge damage. The farms where they were reported escalated at an alarming rate the past four years.
- What were we doing and what was available to control of jackals

1. The clubs operated jointly in this regard and have two sets of poison ejectors which could be applied on request. Messrs. D.J. van Zyl, I.D.P. Vollgraaff and H.C. Steenkamp were well trained to handle the poison ejectors and have the necessary permits. With reference to the new firearms act there were still some uncertainty and unresolved aspects regarding poison ejectors.
2. A limited number of foothold traps could be provided to farmers.
3. A limited number of poison collars were available. Collars have a limited effective lifetime of three years, provided it was stored well when not used. Collars were very expensive and would only be recommended in exceptional circumstances.
4. During July 2005, the clubs organised a training course in night shooting. Seven persons completed the course of which six were still active in some way. Effective equipment was expensive and clubs needed financial assistance to make the basic, but effective equipment available. At the time, night shooting seemed to be the most effective control method, but a few remarks were necessary regarding the method:

4.1 It was not as easy as it seemed and persons without the necessary training only worsen the problem, because they allow the jackals to become wiser.
4.2 For novices every hunt was an amazing experience and must be given adequate scope to develop.
4.3 Every hunter must be given a specific area and familiarise him with the surroundings and possible hunting behaviour of the jackal.
4.4 Access roads must be made accessible by landowners to facilitate easier movement.
4.5 Information of a farm was important to make coordinated action easier.

- What were planned for the future

1. In principle, the two clubs approved at their annual meetings that they would continue to function jointly, but in the meantime continue to exist individually because of several reasons.
2. The clubs would extend their activities with a general restructuring of the larger part of the Vanrhynsdorp district (see attached map).
3. On 2 November 2005, discussions were held with the West Coast District Municipality. Apparently, the Department of Agriculture could obtain funds to investigate the jackal problem in the area. It was decided in principle to hold a workshop with stakeholders early in 2006. The West Coast District Municipality would act as coordinator.
4. Members of the existing clubs already indicated that they MUST continue with control and would not stop operations.
5. The area currently served by the clubs (see attached map) covers about 110 000 square km of which about 80 000 square km have been infiltrated by black-backed jackals. The increased area would thus require more manpower, equipment and funds to be effective.
6. Negotiations regarding the problem would be continued with local authorities, Cape Nature Conservation[758] and the Department of Agriculture. However, it would carry more weight if discussions and negotiations would be conducted on behalf of the total farming community, specifically including emerging farmers.

[758] Editors' Note: being CapeNature.

Version 5.0 - Hoede Wraak - Version 5.0

7. It was already made clear to the previously mentioned organisations that:
(a) the right to protect own property would not be waived,
(b) No contributions would be made to establish a Bioregion, Conservation Areas or the promotion of Tourism in the region, unless a meaningful contribution was made to the problem of farmers.
8. Vanrhynsdorp has its own Water Users Association, primarily for the irrigation area in catchment area E33F. Catchment areas E33C + E40D and parts of E24M and E33G would also be placed under management of the Vanrhynsdorp Water Users Association. It was the service area of the Nama Karoo Water Forum, which included the larger part of the district. Water for livestock and household consumption did not require registration, but was part of the total resource and required to be managed.

The Vanrhynsdorp Water Users Association was a statutory body with executive powers. The constitution also allows it to perform other functions. It implies that for example the infrastructure of the Water Users Association may be used to charge levies to reduce the cost of problem animal control.

9. The goal was not to exterminate everything. It should be a targeted action in harmony with the ecosystem. In addition, the problem should be addressed over a wider front than currently the case.

- <u>FUNDS</u>
- The problem was faced amidst very difficult and unfriendly agricultural conditions. Not only the drought but also the authorities involved that stopped their contributions and responsibilities, while agriculture must pay additional levies and taxes for which no services are received.
- Unfortunately, funds would also be required to effectively address the challenge.
- The tariffs were R1.20 per km, R150.00 night fees per 2-person team, and R500.00 per jackal and R200.00 per caracal killed.
- It was envisaged to introduce levies per ha. Management would investigate this possibility and inform farm owners as soon as possible.
- It would be a voluntary effort by farmers to address the problem. Nobody could, or would be forced to contribute. However, those that do not pay could not expect any assistance.
- Attached was short questionnaire to determine interest and the number of ha involved. It was necessary for planning and to create infrastructure.
- If somebody had a problem, or foresee a problem with problem animals, it was the opportunity to contribute. If not, nobody should waste each other's time.
- The completed questionnaire could be send (posted, phoned or faxed – relevant info listed) to Mr. W.J van der Westhuizen or Mr. D.J. van Zyl before 31 March 2006.
- <u>QUESTIONNAIRE VANRHYNSDORP PROBLEM ANIMAL CONTROL</u>
- Name of Landowner or Tenant:
- Name of Farm or Farms according to title deeds, with the number of ha for each farm:
- Were you prepared to participate in problem animal control from 1 January 2006?
- Postal address / Residential address / telephone number / Fax number / cell number.

2006

At the invitation of Mr. Hannes Stadler of CapeNature, Western Cape Province, an ALPRU team visited Vrolijkheid from 21-24 January 2006. The ALPRU team comprised Dr. Nico Avenant, Mr. Willie Combrinck and Prof. HO de Waal. They were welcomed by Mr. Stadler at Vrolijkheid and assisted to access important historical files on predation management in the erstwhile Cape Province.

Vrolijkheid is located 12 km south of Robertson on the road to McGregor and since 1958, it became well known as the Vermin Research Farm and Hound Breeding Station, as well as

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

the headquarters of the Division Problem Animal Control of the CPA's Department of Nature Conservation. The hound breeding stations at Vrolijkheid and at Adelaide were closed in 1989. The sale of hounds was phased out and all aspects of problem animal hunting hounds in the Cape Province were taken over by the private sector.

At the time of the visit to Vrolijkheid (21-24 January 2006), the facilities which were previously dedicated to predation management, including the horse stables used by hunters attending the courses, were used as training centre for social projects.

The specific objective of the visit to Vrolijkheid was to retrieve and duplicate old monthly hunt reports of hunt clubs, as well as other documents pertaining to predation management in the erstwhile Cape Province. A large amount of documents was retrieved at Vrolijkheid and provided by Mr. Hannes Stadler from his CapeNature office at Porterville; electronic copies were made of the documents for studying and storage in the archive of ALPRU's CCP. Information sourced from these official files were analysed for the M.Sc. study by Gunter (2008).

A broad group of invitees received the following invitation on 3 March 2006:

"HOLISTIC MANAGEMENT OF HUMAN-WILDLIFE CONFLICT IN SOUTH AFRICA
10 - 13 April 2006
Ganzekraal Conference Centre, Western Cape
"Prevention is the Cure!"

Dear Invitee

The Conservation Breeding Specialist Group (CBSG) Southern Africa, the Endangered Wildlife Trust (EWT), CapeNature and the National Council of SPCAs are jointly convening a national workshop entitled: ***The holistic management of human-wildlife conflict in South Africa.***

The workshop will bring together stakeholders from around South Africa representing the farming and agricultural sector, provincial and national conservation authorities, conservation organisations and NGOs, animal welfare organisations, communities and academic institutions, to share information and ideas between the groups of participants and create a better understanding of all components of this contentious issue and attempt to improve current practices by:

- *exploring various prevention/exclusionary techniques for keeping damage-causing wildlife out of small areas;*
- *developing a manual of guidelines for best practice on "problem animal" control/prevention/exclusion with non-lethal alternatives, exclusionary techniques and target specific methods for farmers/provincial authorities to use;*
- *developing a proposal for a revision of the relevant legislation including species lists and controversial terms such as "problem animals" and "vermin" species;*
- *drafting proposed legislation on the banning of unethical, inhumane, non-target-specific lethal and/or injurious methods;*
- *exploring the possibility of establishing ethical brands for agricultural products such as beef and mutton, farmed using only ethical predator control or exclusion methods.*

The outcomes of this workshop will include:

- *a manual of best practice guidelines on human-wildlife conflict prevention and control;*
- *improved management of farming land with reduced abuse of poisons, agri-chemicals and lethal/injurious traps whilst at the same time reducing human-wildlife conflict and damage/losses;*
- *revised and improved legislation dealing with "problem animals" and "vermin";*

Version 2.0 - HPO de Waal - Version 5.0

- *increased consumer demand for agricultural goods derived from farms employing exclusionary or ethical predator management techniques;*
- *reduced opportunities for conflict and economic loss and thus for cruel and unethical treatment of so-called "vermin" species; and*
- *improved communication and information sharing between the stakeholder groups*."

The initiative to invite a broad spectrum of role players and specifically representatives from affected parties such as organised agriculture was a momentous step forward. However, it was noted that representation of livestock producers' was a definite minority.

Unlike the three livestock producers' organisations (NWGA, RPO and SAMGA), the history of the organised wildlife ranching fraternity, namely the South African Game Ranchers' Organisation (SAGRO) and then the Wildlife Ranching SA (WRSA) was more recent. Excerpts from the early history provided by Mr. Borrie Erasmus[759] are cited:

- A first recorded step to organise the South African game farmers was taken on 29 February 1972 in Bloemfontein. A meeting of the Free State Agriculture Union's Nature Conservation Committee was attended by: Messrs. H.F. Prinsloo (Heuningkrans, Smithfield - Chairman), C.J. Retief (Three Fountains, Harrismith), J.P. Swart (PO Box 404, Kroonstad), J. le R. Pieterse (Groneging, Smithfield) and also by Mr. Bourquin (Provincial Administration, Bloemfontein).
- A decision by the committee referred to an association of game owners: "*6. <u>Request - Game Owners Association</u>: With reference to a request by this association to the Free State Agricultural Union for an address list of its affiliates to recruit members, the Committee decided not to provide such address lists. All items the association wished to send out must be channelled through the Union's office for distribution.*"
- Apparently, the word "*bewarea*[760]" stemmed from this meeting.
- A Nature Conservation Conference and a meeting of the committee was held on 1 November 1973 at Golden Gate in the eastern Free State. The minutes [paragraph 2(c)(ii)] reflected on an important issue: "*<u>Ownership of game</u>: The committee DECIDED THAT Mr. C.J. Retief must edit his memorandum and submit it to the office before being handled again to make the necessary representations.*"
- Initially the game organisation was only committees at provincial as well as national level. A prominent link was Mr. Jan van der Walt, an official of the SAAU with administrative/secretarial roles in the red meat and game committees. This gave rise to a federal structure with autonomous provincial organisations to which members subscribed. The national management consisted of only one or two members per province and it was the beginning of the South African Game Ranchers' Organisation (SAGRO).
- The provinces functioned with varying success. Although the provinces tried their best, speaking with one tongue when negotiating with government remained a shortcoming. The Northern Game Ranchers' Organisation with its four provinces could identify the problem easier and a north/south difference of opinion became stronger.
- Dr. André Moolman was elected again as Chairman at SAGRO's annual meeting in March 2005. The previous he indicated that would not be available for election again. Therefore, his re-election and unilaterally inviting other persons to attend the executive, created tension and dissatisfaction with at least one MEC.
- A special meeting was convened on 21 June 2005 at the offices of Free State Agriculture in Bloemfontein. Five minutes after starting the meeting, it adjourned for 10 minutes to allow for caucusing. When the meeting resumed, the Chairman Dr. Moolman resigned. Mr.

[759] Erasmus, Borrie, 2016. WRSA-erfenis, Ontwikkeling in die wildbedryf van toeka tot nou. Wildlife Ranching Issue 6 2016, 31-37.
[760] A composite of the Afrikaans words "bewaar area" (= "conservation area").

Version 5.0 - Not a Final - Version 5.0

Borrie Erasmus was elected Chairman of SAGRO and Mr. Coert Steynberg as Deputy Chairman.

- To defuse tensions between opposing parties, Mr. Erasmus insisted on holding a strategic session to determine the future. The two-day session was attended by a small group of people and facilitated by Dr. Theo de Jager. It became clear that the federal structure of SAGRO where membership is vested in provinces must be abolished. Membership must be at a national level. Directors will manage the organisation and all functions executed at national level only.
- Mr. Borrie Erasmus and Dr. Gert Dry were tasked to draft a constitution. Meetings were held in the different provinces to lobby for the concept and structure of an envisaged new organisation for wildlife ranchers in South Africa.
- SAGRO was officially dissolved on 17 March 2006 and the Wildlife Ranching South Africa (WRSA) was founded immediately. Mr. Borrie Erasmus was the first President and Mr. Coert Steynberg the Vice-President. Directors were Mr. Reuben Saayman (research), Mr. Jacques Malan (regulatory), Mr. Peet Koen (finances), Dr. Gert Dry (administration) and Mr. Gary van den Berg (liaison with government).

It was only later (sometime during 2007) that WRSA joined forces with the three livestock groupings and other role players to manage predation.

The National Forum for Damage Causing Animals held its annual meeting on 23 March 2006 in the boardroom of Senwes, Bloemfontein[761]. Excerpts from the minutes (translation) are quoted below:

> "*<u>Present</u>: Petrus de Wet (Chairman, NWGA), Leon de Beer (NWGA), Hendrik Botha (NWGA), Johannes Klopper (NWGA), Jako Meyer (NWGA), Jaap Pienaar (Dept. Economic Affairs, Nature Conservation and Tourism, Eastern Cape), Tommie van der Walt (NWGA), Nico Laubscher (Dept. Nature Conservation, Northern Cape), Douglas Calldo (NWGA), Gert Loggenberg (NWGA), Jan Louis Venter (NWGA), Hannes Blom (Dept. Tourism, Environment and Economic Affairs, Free State), Robert Wilke (Dept. Tourism, Environment and Economic Affairs, Free State), Lourens Goosen (Dept. Tourism, Environment and Economic Affairs, Free State), HO de Waal (ALPRU), Bertie Fourie (RPO), Coligny Stegmann (SAMGA), Thys de Wet and Bonita Francis (Secretary). <u>Apologies</u>: Andre Strydom (Cape Wools SA), Richard Schutte (KZN Nature Conservation), Tim Snow (Endangered Wildlife Trust – Poison Working Group), Gawie Hugo (NWGA), Lourens Badenhorst (Gauteng Nature Conservation), CJ Pietersen (Agri Eastern Cape), Hannes Stadler (CapeNature, Western Cape), Sarel van der Merwe (ALPRU), Dr. Nico Avenant (ALPRU), Willie Combrinck (ALPRU), Peter Schneekluth and Kerneels Greyling.*
>
> - *Condolences were expressed on the passing away of Briers Bekker and Johan Lensing.*
> - *The meeting noted that the first presentation by Prof. HO de Waal on behalf of ALPRU at the meeting of 1 March 2005 was not noted in the minutes.*
> - *In the second presentation on behalf of ALPRU[762] Prof. HO de Waal alluded to "the collection, interpretation and dissemination of all available data and information on the black-backed jackal and caracal." Many answers were available to manage predation but there was a general lack of implementation. He stressed the importance of expert officials and competent hunters to successfully manage predation. <u>Discussions</u> by*

[761] Notule – Vergadering van Nasionale Probleemdierbeleidskomitee - 23 Maart 2006, Senwes, Bloemfontein.

[762] De Waal, HO, Avenant, Nico & Combrinck, Willie, 2006. The Canis-Caracal Programme – collating and interpreting available data and information on black-backed jackal and caracal. National Forum for Animal Damage Control. 23 March 2006. NWGA Board Room, Bloemfontein, South Africa.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

meeting: (i) in the past hunt clubs functioned and data was collected but not interpreted; predation management does not mean extermination of all predators; (ii) problem animals cannot be controlled if fences on farms are not maintained; (iii) Population control is needed instead of control of damage; the problem animal populations must be brought to acceptable levels; (iv) it is important that skilled experts must control problem animals; the damage caused by 'bounty hunters", namely every second person and specifically in Mpumalanga Province is a big problem; they are paid for every black-backed jackal killed without necessarily solving the problem; (v) Prof. HO de Waal thanked Cape Wools SA for contributing towards funding of the research project; it is important that the project to provide scientific solutions for the South African livestock farmers, even if money is not forthcoming from the NGWA, RPO and SAMGA; and (vi) it was decided that Prof. HO de Waal must submit a proposal to Cape Wools SA, RPO and SAMGA for continued funding for the project.

- *The Chairman provided background on a draft resolution at the NWGA's recent Eastern Cape Annual Congress regarding a central provisioning centre for small livestock farmers to get hunt hounds to control black-backed jackal, caracal and leopard. The meeting resolved unanimously that such a centre should be created in the Eastern Cape Province to provide a "toolbox" of organised problem animal control methods for small livestock farmers.*
- *Mr. Petrus de Wet, the Chairman shared the PHASA's (Professional Hounds man Association of South Africa) viewpoint regarding the use of hunt hounds, namely: "Besides the concerns of the NSPCA who may claim it is illegal, PHASA does not have any other specific information on the pressure hunting with hounds is currently facing. However, it is very vulnerable to negative press coverage, which could once again affect negatively the image of sport hunting. PHASA does not support the sport hunting of leopards with hounds. PHASA has no problem in using hounds to control problem animals. PHASA will likely distance itself from sport hunting with hounds. However, it will not oppose using hounds to control problem animals if it is done in a legal manner, with permits, as has always been the case." Mr. Thys de Wet was concerned that the Workshop scheduled for 10-13 April 2006 at Ganzekraal will try to stop the hunting with hounds; the organisers were opposed to the killing of animals, hence the theme "Prevention is the cure." Mr. Jaap Pienaar stated that the NSPCA was not opposed to hunting of declared problem animals with hounds; they seem to prefer it to the use of poison. He suggested that the NSCPA must be afforded the opportunity to state their viewpoint but the viewpoint of the National Forum for Damage Causing Animals must also be heard. Mr. Klopper proposed that Mr. de Wet be mandated to attend the Ganzekraal Workshop to stem the possible onslaught against the control of problem animals and suggested the information must also appear in the press. The meeting resolved to mandate Mr. Klopper[763] as official representative of the Committee at the Ganzekraal Workshop; members may attend in their personal capacities.*
- *Mr. Petrus de Wet explained the dilemma of a farmer who planted maize for his dairy cows and the resulting damage caused by bush pigs. The farmer contracted a specialist hunter to control the bush pigs, but then the hunter was denied access to a neighbour's farm. Mr. Jaap Pienaar briefly explained the basic complexities involved and the interpretation of laws and the Constitution; he requested the support of the National Forum for Damage Causing Animals to take the matter further and obtain legal opinion regarding possible changes in legislation. It was resolved that Mr. Pienaar must take the matter further.*

[763] In e-mail (31 March 2006, 02:40:49 PM) the NWGA informed the organising committee of the Ganzekraal Workshop that Mr. Smiley de Beer (NGWA, Western Cape Province) will attend instead of Mr. Klopper.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

- *Mr. Petrus de Wet stated that the Compound 1080 project was continued under the guidance of Mr. Willie van Zijl. Farmers may buy the poison but it only formed part of the project when contained in a LPC. The representative of the Free State Nature Conservation cautioned that the poison was illegal and persons found in possession will be prosecuted.*
- *Mr. Thys de Wet announced the founding of his new company, the Animal Damage Control Institute. It was developing a new product, which contained cyanide in a waterproof capsule and will be swallowed by black-backed jackals. It was a more acceptable way to use poison with less suffering compared to Compound 1080. He requested financial support; it was resolved that a business plan must be submitted for consideration.*
- *It was noted that the Free State Nature Conservation was considering new legislation and the chapter on problem animal control will be revised; April or May 2006 will conclude public participation. Input by committee members must be communicated to Mr. Hannes Blom.*
- *Mr. Thys de Wet referred to the similarities between the coyote in America and black-backed jackal in South Africa. It was disappointing that lessons learnt with the coyote cannot be confirmed locally with appropriate research. He was advised to submit a project proposal for consideration by the Red Meat Research and Development Trust.*
- *Mr. Hannes Blom informed the meeting that the training manual for problem animal control must be revised; it is a huge undertaking and somebody should be tasked to complete the task, which had been dragging on for more than four years. It was noted that Mr. Hannes Stadler had indicated that the topic will be discussed at the Ganzekraal Workshop and that EWT had provided sponsorship for a person to conduct the revision. Mr. Klopper suggested that Mr. Thys de Wet, who is engaged in a study to obtain a M.Sc. qualification, be approached for this task. It was noted that an outcome of the Workshop was to produce "a manual of best practice guidelines on human-wildlife conflict prevention and control." The meeting decided to await the results of the Workshop.*
- *Mr. Nico Laubscher stated that Ordinance 19 of 1974 for the Northern Cape Province was currently revised. It will entail hunting seasons, daily hunt bags and hunting of black-backed jackal and caracal with restricted methods.*
- *It was decided unanimously that this grouping will revert back to its previous name and thus operate as the National Problem Animal Policy Committee."*

The Ganzekraal Workshop: Holistic Management of Human-Wildlife Conflict in the Agricultural Sector of South Africa convened from 10-13 April 2006 at the Ganzekraal Nature Reserve, near Cape Town in the Western Cape Province. It was jointly organised by the Conservation Breeding Specialist Group (CBSG) of the IUCN Species Survival Commission Southern Africa, the Endangered Wildlife Trust (EWT), the National Council of SPCAs and CapeNature. The Workshop brought together 55 "*participants from around South Africa representing the farming and agricultural sector, provincial and national conservation authorities, conservation organisations and NGOs, animal welfare organisations, communities and academic institutions*."

The Proceedings of the Ganzekraal Workshop[764] included an Executive Summary, the Conservation Breeding Specialist Group (CBSG) Workshop Process and Summary of Key Issues, and Proposed Interventions; these items are quoted below:

"*EXECUTIVE SUMMARY*

[764] Daly, B., Davies-Mostert, H., Davies-Mostert, W., Evans, S., Friedmann, Y., King, N., Snow, T. & Stadler, H. (eds.): 2006. Prevention is the Cure. Proceedings of a workshop on holistic management of human-wildlife conflict in the agricultural sector of South Africa. Endangered Wildlife Trust, Johannesburg.

Version 5.0 – Not the final version 5.0

As a direct result of the general extermination of larger predators such as Lion (Panthera leo) and Brown Hyaena (Hyaena brunnea) in some regions of South Africa, the Black-backed Jackal (Canis mesomelas) and the Caracal or Lynx (Caracal caracal) have become bigger threats to livestock, while smaller carnivores such as genets (Genetta spp.), mongooses (Cynictus spp., Ichneumia spp., Galerella spp. and Paracynictus spp.) and otters (Lutra spp. and Aonyx spp.) cause occasional losses of poultry. Predators and scavengers have long been indiscriminately and unethically persecuted causing the relationships between the predators and their natural prey to be irreparably altered. This forms the basis of South Africa's "damage-causing animal" situation today.

A variety of methods of killing "problem animals" are used today including traps, poisons, snares, 'coyote getters' and other lethal weaponry. These also cause significant mortality amongst non-target species such as the Bat-eared Fox (Otocyon megalotis), Aardwolf (Proteles cristatus), Suricata (Suricata suricatta), many bird species and other small carnivores. The Endangered Wildlife Trust's Poison Working Group (PWG) estimates that in excess of 500 000 wild birds and animals die from poisoning alone in South Africa every year. The indiscriminate trapping of animals in gin traps often causing a slow and agonising death and the death of many non-target species, continues in many agricultural areas in South Africa today. This unacceptable situation led to the three-host organisation, namely the Endangered Wildlife Trust, CapeNature and the NSPCA to secure the funding to convene this workshop in an attempt to finally develop a coherent, holistic and non-lethal approach to resolving human-wildlife conflict in the agricultural sector in South Africa.

Negative attitudes towards carnivores continue to prevail with some species still labelled as 'vermin'. Conservation authorities must therefore strive to change these attitudes by supplying farmers and landowners with appropriate information, empowering them to employ alternative exclusionary control measures and changing the relevant legislation and regulations.

To address this serious situation, the Conservation Breeding Specialist Group (CBSG) Southern Africa, the Endangered Wildlife Trust (EWT), CapeNature and the National Council of SPCAs jointly convened a national workshop from the 10th – 13th of April 2006 at the Ganzekraal Conference Centre in the Western Cape entitled: ***The holistic management of human-wildlife conflict in South Africa****. The workshop brought together fifty-five participants from around South Africa representing the farming and agricultural sector, provincial and national conservation authorities, conservation organisations and NGOs, animal welfare organisations, communities and academic institutions. This was an opportunity to share information, to create a better understanding of all components of this contentious issue and attempt to improve current practices by:*

i. exploring various exclusionary techniques for keeping damage-causing wildlife out of farmland;
ii. developing a manual of guidelines for best practice on non-lethal "problem animal" control, so providing preventive measures to farmers and provincial authorities;
iii. developing a proposal for a revision of relevant legislation; and
iv. exploring the possibility of establishing ethical brands for agricultural products such as beef and mutton, farmed using only ethical predator control or exclusionary methods.

A holistic approach must be implemented to address these problems and "best-practice" preventative measures should be established to effectively reduce human-wildlife conflict. A preventative approach addresses the problem rather than the "problem animal". Three principles therefore underpinned the workshop:

Version 5.0 - Hendi de Waal - Version 5.0

i. No species as a whole can be designated as problematic, only specific damage-causing individuals.
ii. Prevention has to become the preferred method of conflict management; and lethal and/or injurious techniques to kill or capture wildlife should no longer be promoted or utilised.
iii. Overall, the key principle upon which the workshop was convened is that Prevention is the Cure to solving human-wildlife conflict in South Africa. This marks a significant change in attitude and is in-line with new thinking world-wide whereby, environmental issues should be managed within ecological parameters rather than destroying ecological components of ecosystems, which then leads to further and often greater, problems.

In preparation for the workshop, a briefing document was prepared for all workshop participants. This included the historical perspective on the development of problem animal management in the Cape Province by Hannes Stadler, advantages and disadvantages of various control methods and an overview of the provincial legislation and policies regulating the control of problem or damage-causing animals. Participants were asked to prepare for the workshop by reading through the relevant documentation and providing feedback at the workshop.

THE CBSG WORKSHOP PROCESS

Workshop Design

The workshop process comprised a series of plenary and working group sessions in which groups worked through tasks designed to facilitate free thinking, brainstorming, discussion, debate and finally, consensus building.

Four working groups were established to deal with the following:

- *Best Practice Norms and Standards for Human-Wildlife Conflict Mitigation.*
- *Legislation (revision of relevant legislation pertaining to the terms problem animal and lists of vermin species, legislative gaps and opportunities; and incentives).*
- *Research and Information (identify gaps in data and knowledge; and mitigation measures).*
- *Green Labelling (ethical branding for agricultural products using only exclusionary techniques and develop criteria).*

The workshop ran over two and a half days and comprised four breakout sessions. In the first session participants clarified the specific vision for the working group, recorded what the current situation was pertaining to the topic of their working group and identified constraints to achieving the working group's vision. In session two the working groups defined what the intermediate objectives to overcome the constraints identified in session one were and devised actions and steps towards achieving the intermediate objectives en route to the overall vision.

In break-out session three, the group expanded on specific details related to the actions steps, such as: What will be done?; How?; By whom?; With which partners?; By when?; With what measures?

Session four included the integration of plans and actions and determined the way forward, based on the outputs of the first three sessions. Frequent plenary discussions between sessions enabled groups to present the interim results of their discussions and obtain the input of all participants, which resulted in additional debate and insight from members of other working groups.

SUMMARY OF KEY ISSUES AND PROPOSED INTERVENTIONS

Participants at the workshop unanimously agreed to the following vision:

Version 5.0 - Hoedspruit - Version 5.0

'By 2010 in South Africa, land-use and biodiversity conservation co-exist sustainably through the agreed implementation of humane, ecologically and economically sound management practices which significantly reduce respective loss and conflict.'

Unpacking of ideas: Apply all means available to reduce livestock losses by 2010, quantify real losses and determine perceived losses. Timeline related to developing policy and guidelines (norms and standards). Differences on how provinces are dealing with the problem.

Targets by 2010:

- *Real reduction (50%) in stock losses currently being reported (within 5 years).*
- *Revised national legislative framework with norms, standards and indicators.*
- *Approved national norms and standards, guidelines for management of human-wildlife conflict, linked to green labelling.*
- *Develop an ethical culture amongst farmers and landowners.*
- *Peaceful coexistence by reducing the human-wildlife conflict in these areas (quantify the effects).*

Process:

- *Develop manual or best-practice guidelines for human-wildlife conflict management based on non-lethal alternatives/exclusionary techniques and target specific methods for farmers/provincial authorities to use.*
- *Develop a proposal for revising the relevant legislation (removal of terms "problem animal" and the list of "vermin" species) and identify legislative gaps and opportunities/incentives.*
- *Develop a proposal for green labelling/ethical branding of agricultural products such as beef and mutton, farmed using only ethical wildlife damage control exclusion methods.*

Listed below are the summaries of the issues and interventions proposed by the four working groups:

1. Best Practice Norms and Standards for Human-Wildlife Conflict Mitigation Working Group

The group's vision is: By 2010, to have implemented a national programme dealing with human-wildlife conflict management which promotes humane, ecologically and economically sound land-use and animal husbandry practices through the acceptance of norms and standards and appropriate incentives.

This will be achieved by merging existing "problem animal control" manuals into a single document admitting only exclusionary techniques and develop a comprehensive toolkit (manual and handbook) to assist landowners to manage wildlife conflict, to be endorsed by Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism (DEAT). Build staff capacity and develop necessary resources (perceived to be inadequate due to the lack of manpower, capacity and resources within the provinces). Empower stock farmers and the public through training to better manage the situation. Incentives need to be developed for ethical conflict prevention and management for example sponsorship of preventative equipment, guard dogs, appropriate fencing, etc. An approved 'first line' contact system for help (help-line) within each nature conservation agency should be established nationally.

2. Legislation Working Group

The group's vision is: By 2010, to have a uniform set of legislation that regulates the management of damage-causing animals throughout South Africa through exclusionary means (national norms and standards and provincial legislation).

The first step in the process will be the consolidation of information and compilation of an inventory of current legislation, policies and manuals from the various provinces.

Version 5.0 - UO de Waal - Version 5.0

Relevant stakeholders need to be identified to actively participate in the development of national norms and standards ensuring agreement between provinces, stakeholders and national government on development regarding process and content. Promote alignment of provincial legislation with national norms and standards.

3. Research and Information Working Group

The group's vision is: Research that is directed towards finding practical solutions to change conflict into peaceful coexistence and available information on the techniques that work should be widely disseminated.

The group flagged that there are currently gaps in our knowledge regarding the extent of stock losses, the available management options and efficacy of such options and poor collation of existing data. Priority activities include compiling an inventory of existing and potential research institutions and list of priority research areas. The group also identified a need to disseminate relevant information on results of appropriate and user-friendly packages for implementation; the creation of a comprehensive database of existing and potential organisations involved in research on human-wildlife conflict; and the evaluation of existing conflict reduction methods using existing data.

4. Green Labelling Working Group

The group's vision is: By 2010, land-use and biodiversity conservation coexist in a sustainable manner through the implementation of an accredited certification system for agricultural products.

The group was of the opinion that this could best be tackled by establishing an umbrella group (task team) that will encompass all green labelling programmes and projects in South Africa, thereby working towards development of an authority to oversee the green labelling of agricultural products in South Africa. This will include:

i) the development of standards and principles (a code of conduct);
ii) an effective auditing system;
iii) a legal regulatory framework (brand name recognisable nationally and internationally);
iv) "Green Label" implementation strategy; and
v) incentives encouraging people to buy into the concept."

In their presentations at the Ganzekraal Workshop, Dr. Nico Avenant[765] and Prof. HO de Waal[766] both emphasised the paucity of reliable information and data regarding predation management in South Africa and the focus of ALPRU's Canis-Caracal Programme (CCP) on the black-backed jackal and the caracal, namely:

1. Collate and interpret all available data and information on these two predator species and disseminate recommendations.
2. Initiate, support and conduct scientific studies on the ecology of these two predator species and their food base.
3. Formulate new or update existing scientific management strategies to regulate these two predator species and relate it to provincial and national policies.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

[765] Avenant, N.L., De Waal, H.O. & Combrinck, W., 2006. The Canis-Caracal Programme: a holistic approach. In: Proceedings of the national *Workshop on the holistic management of human-wildlife conflict in South Africa, 10-13 April 2006.* Ganzekraal Conference Centre, Western Cape. Daly, B., Davies-Mostert, H., Davies-Mostert, W., Evans, S., Friedmann, Y., King, N., Snow, T. & Stadler, H. (eds.). Endangered Wildlife Trust, Johannesburg, South Africa.

[766] De Waal, H.O., Avenant, N. & Combrinck, W., 2006. The Canis-Caracal Programme – the initiative and a holistic approach. In: *Holistic Management of Human-Wildlife Conflict in South-Africa – Briefing Book*. Ganzekraal Workshop, Western Cape, South Africa. 10-13 April.

Important aspects of the input made by these representatives of ALPRU's CCP at the Ganzekraal Workshop were accommodated in the vision expressed by the 3rd Working Group on "Research and Information".

In retrospect it seems the Ganzekraal Workshop was well timed and a long overdue catalyst for the national and provincial departments of environmental affairs to officially engage in addressing human-wildlife conflict, specifically predation, in South Africa.

On 8 June 2006, Prof. HO de Waal gave a presentation[767] on the Canis-Caracal Programme to the annual congress of SAMGA in Port Elizabeth. This was a first of similar and more specific presentations to a wide range of role players in South Africa.

In June 2006, the Landbouweekblad published allegations by Mr. Magre van Deventer, age 33 of Uitenhage, regarding the perceived negative effects of Compound 1080 on his health. He had been the manager of the commercial branch of an agricultural business and at the age of 30, was diagnosed with amyotrophic lateral sclerosis; he linked this health condition to exposure to "*1080, as well as other organophosphates*."

A new process was started by DEAT on 19 June 2006 by publishing "*Draft regulations relating to listed Threatened or Protected Species*"[768]. This process to draft TOPS regulations ran concurrently with DEAT's drafting of other regulations, namely the "*National principles, norms and standards for the sustainable use of large predators in South Africa*" of 13 June 2003, the "*Draft National Norms and Standards for the sustainable use of large predators*" of 28 January 2005 and the "*Draft regulations relating to the keeping and hunting of Acinonyx jubatus, Hyaena brunnea, Crocuta crocuta, Lycaon pictus, Panthera leo and Panthera pardus*" of 28 January 2005. The different but concurrent processes have confounded important related aspects and issues.

On 20 September 2006, Prof. HO de Waal gave a presentation[769] on the Canis-Caracal Programme to the Agricultural Association at Boshof, Free State Province.

On 20 September 2006[770] Mr. D.J. van Zyl (Brakvlei Hunt Club, Lutzville, Western Cape) wrote to Mr. Hannes Stadler (Programme Manager: Wildlife Management, Biodiversity Support Services, CapeNature) regarding 'Information Brakvlei Hunt Club' (translation):

- At a meeting of the Brakvlei Hunt Club that was held on 19 October 2005 with Mr. Kobus Kritzinger, Mr. Stadler told the meeting:
  1. Early in January 2006, a document would be circulated for farmers to provide input and accept or reject proposal regarding the new act.
  2. A workshop on problem animal control would be held at Fransekraal[771] and all hunt clubs would be notified well in advance.
- The members of the club inquired whether such a document have been circulated.
- In addition, why the Hunt Club and the surrounding clubs were not informed about the workshop that had been held. After the conclusion of the workshop, the event was only noted by chance in the media.

[767] De Waal, HO, Avenant, Nico & Combrinck, Willie, 2006. The Canis-Caracal Programme. South African Mohair Growers' Association. 63rd Annual General Congress. 7 & 8 June 2006. Wool and Mohair Exchange, Port Elizabeth, South Africa.
[768] Minister of Environmental Affairs and Tourism published Draft Regulations relating to listed Threatened or Protected Species (TOPS) on 19 June 2006.
[769] De Waal, HO, Avenant, Nico, Gunter, Quinette & Combrinck, Willie, 2006. Die Canis-Caracal Program. Agri Boshof. 20 September 2006. Stadsaal, Boshof, Vrystaat Provinsie, Suid-Afrika.
[770] File CapeNature: Hunt Reports, Breërivier Regional Services Council.
[771] Editor's Note: It was Ganzekraal.

Version 5.0 HO de Waal Version 5.0

- The Hunt Club wanted to be kept informed on a regular basis regarding decisions on the new act. They also urgently needed answers on the questions, because the Department requested cooperation between problem animal clubs and the Department, although information on important matters mentioned previously was not provided to the club.

An ALPRU team, comprising Mr. Willie Combrinck and Prof. HO de Waal visited the Outeniqua Experimental Station, near George in the Western Cape Province on 29 October 2006. A systematic search was made in the files of the Department of Agriculture to find records of specific farms where technical activities such as farm planning, construction of dams, development of contours and fences had been conducted. Such files contained maps of the farms and could be used to identify farms by name and number on geographical maps (scale: 1:50 000) and electronically on GPS. The information was used in a study by Ms. Quinette Gunter[772] to analyse the monthly hunt records of the Cooper Jagklub and the adjacent Mosselbaai Sentrale Jagklub in the Mossel Bay District.

On 1 December 2006[773] Mr. Hannes Stadler (Programme Manager: Wildlife Management, Biodiversity Support Services, CapeNature) referred the letter of Mr. D.J. van Zyl (Brakvlei Hunt Club, Lutzville, Western Cape) regarding 'Information Brakvlei Hunt Club' and wrote (copied to Dr. Kas Hamman, Director: Biodiversity, CapeNature) (translation):

- The letter dated 20 September 2006 was acknowledged and the content noted.
- With reference to the meeting, which was held on 15 October 2005, no further correspondence, specifically the minutes of the meeting, was received from Mr. Van Zyl. At the meeting Mr. Stadler requested farmers to keep record of all livestock losses which could be attributed to predators.
- With regard to the workshop that Mr. Van Zyl referred to in his letter, the workshop was held from 11 to 13 April 2006 at Ganzekraal near Yzerfontein. Attendance was by invitation and representatives of specific organisations attended the workshop. The goal with the national workshop was to reach consensus between Provincial conservation organisations, non-governmental organisations such as the Endangered Wildlife Trust (EWT), National Wool Growers' Association (NWGA) and Animal Welfare organisations such as the S.P.C.A regarding matter such as:
  - firstly, on the approach that should be followed with control of predators; and
  - secondly, on acceptable practices or a code of best practices for the control of predators responsible for livestock losses.
- The workshop was conducted in the national context and the costs of about R50 000 was sponsored largely by the EWT; therefore, the organisers primarily had to depend on their final arrangements.
- The document (draft regulations for the control of problem animals in the Western Cape) that Mr. van Zyl referred to would have been distributed early in January. However, the document was withheld because CapeNature was informed the National Minister of Environmental Affairs, Minister Marthinus van Schalkwyk was going to publish for public participations National Norms and Standards to regulate the Hunting Industry in South Africa. It would have been futile for CapeNature to continue finalising the provincial regulations, knowing very well of a process to develop national guidelines (norms and standards) for the control of 'problem animals'.
- This national document was published in the government gazette on 5 May 2006; it was widely distributed by CapeNature and broad coverage was given in the media. Mr. Stadler

[772] Gunter, Quinette, 2008. A critical evaluation of historical data on two damage causing predators, *Canis mesomelas* and Caracal *caracal*. M.Sc. dissertation. University of the Free State, Bloemfontein, South Africa.
[773] File CapeNature: Hunt Reports, Breërivier Regional Services Council.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

personally attended several national meetings in Pretoria to provide input, with specific reference to the control of damage-causing wild animals or so-called 'problem animals'.

- Mr. Stadler addressed a farmers' association meeting at Vanrhynsdorp in June 2006. More than 40 farmers attended it and he gave detailed feedback regarding the latest developments he referred to previously. In response, several written presentations were received from 'problem animal control' hunt clubs (e.g. Orionskraal, Vanrhynsdorp) regarding the national draft regulations in response to requests made by CapeNature.
- Furthermore, since July 2006 a series of talks were given on Radio Namakwaland regarding topic of problem animal control and the new draft legislation with the presenter being Kobus Kritzinger. In addition, a series of articles were published on the control of 'problem animals' in the quarterly Journal Kaap-Agri (and to his knowledge Lutzville falls within the service delivery area of that AGRICULTURAL COOPERATTIVE).
- On 23 August, Mr. Stadler attended a meeting of the Western Cape Agri's Red Meat Producers' Organisation (RPO) and the matter regarding 'problem animals' was discussed. As a consequence he was approached by Elsenburg (Cape Institute for Agricultural Training) to discuss the possibility to present a formal course in Predator Management as part of the syllabus for the B. Agric. degree. A follow-up meeting was held that morning[774] with the RPO Executive Committee, under guidance of Mr. Johan Bothma, General Manager: Western Cape Agri, to discuss several important aspects.
- With reference to the statement made in the final paragraph of his letter, the following was cited '*… but the Department did not provide the necessary feedback to the club regarding important matters mentioned.*' It was felt that CapeNature had provided sufficient feedback on the matters and although it was not made directly to the hunt club, the media used (e.g. Radio Namakwaland) was aimed at reaching the broadest possible audience at once.
- In conclusion, it remains the primary responsibility of the local nature conservation officials to communicate with the community in their management area regarding applicable matters. The letter suggests Mr. van Zyl was unhappy because it was not communicated directly with his hunt club about these matters. It is trusted the information provided would allow him to provide appropriate feedback to the members.

2007

On 15 February 2007, Prof. HO de Waal gave a presentation[775] on the conservation of larger African predators, including the black-backed jackal and the caracal at a Provincial Game Industry Indaba in Bloemfontein.

On 20 March 2007, Prof. HO de Waal gave a presentation[776] on the Canis-Caracal Programme to the Agricultural Association at Brandfort, Free State Province.

On 2 April 2007, Prof. HO de Waal gave a presentation[777] on the Canis-Caracal Programme (CCP), livestock and predator control at the Glen Agricultural Institute, Free State Province.

The NPAPC held its annual meeting on 26 April 2007 in the boardroom of Senwes, Bloemfontein. Translated excerpts from the minutes (Afrikaans)[778] are quoted below:

[774] Editor's Note: - 1 December 2006.
[775] De Waal, HO, 2007. Conservation and utilization of large predators. MEC Game Industry Indaba. Department of Tourism, Environmental and Economic Affairs. 15 February 2007. Vista Campus, University of the Free State, Bloemfontein, South Africa.
[776] De Waal, HO, Avenant, Nico & Combrinck, Willie, 2007. Die Canis-Caracal Program. "Roofdierbeheer en Veediefstal." NWKV. 20 Maart 2007. Skougronde. Brandfort, Vrystaat Provisie, Suid-Afrika.
[777] De Waal, HO, Avenant, Nico & Combrinck, Willie, 2007. Canis-Caracal Programme. Livestock and Predator Control. 2 April 2007. Glen Agricultural Institute, Free State Province, South Africa.
[778] Minutes – meeting of the National Problem Animal Policy Committee, 26 April 2007, Senwes, Bloemfontein.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

"*Attendees: NWGA - Petrus de Wet, Chairman, Amie Aucamp, NWGA Head Office, KwaZulu-Natal - Boshoff Davel, NWGA Producer (Utrecht), Richard Schutte, KZN Nature Conservation, Mpumalanga - Johannes Klopper, NWGA Production Advisor, Eastern Cape - Ernest Pringle, Agri Eastern Cape, Jaap Pienaar, Economic Affairs, Envir. & Tourism, Northern Cape - TJ v/d der Walt, NWGA Producer (Noupoort), Western Cape - Hannes Stadler, Western Cape Nature Conservation Board, Free State - Gert Loggenberg, NWGA Producer (Harrismith), Hannes Blom, Tourism, Environ. & Economic Aff., Robert Wilke, Tourism, Environ. & Economic Aff., Lourens Goosen, Tourism, Environ. & Economic, Endangered Wildlife Trust: Poison Working Group - Tim Snow, RPO - Gerhard Schutte, SA Mohair Growers Association - Coligny Stegmann, African Large Predator Research Unit (ALPRU) - HO de Waal, Quinette Gunter, Animal Damage Control Institute - Thys de Wet, Dept. of Environmental Affairs & Tourism - Thendo Nethengwe, Snr. Environmental Officer: Policy Development. Apologies: Leon de Beer, General Manager, Hendrik Botha, NWGA Producer (Matatiele), Pikkie Uys, NWGA Producer (Volksrust), Jako Meyer, NWGA Producer (Middelburg), Nico Laubscher, Northern Cape Nature Conserv., Douglas Calldo, NWGA Producer (Laingsburg), Thys Delport, Agri Wes-Cape, Jan Louis Venter, NWGA Production Advisor, Johan Strydom - Problem Animal Hunter, Peter Schneekluth - Problem Animal Control, SA Hounds man Association - Roy Sparks (no apology received), SA Wildboer Vereniging - Piet Du Plessis (no apology received), NSPCA (Wild Life Unit) - Chris Theron, Cape Wools SA - Andre Strydom, Dr. Pieter Botha, DG, Mrs. Thea Carroll.*

1. Opening and Welcoming

Mr. Boshoff Davel opened the meeting with prayer. The Chairman welcomed everyone present.

2. Apologies

See attached list.

3. Minutes for approval

The minutes of the previous meeting was approved.

4. Matters arising from the Minutes

4.1 *Central supply point of organized problem animal control methods in the Eastern Cape*

A need for such a supply point exists. As soon as a suitable person is found to manage such activities, then the matter will be addressed. Scrap from the Agenda.

4.2 *Implications of amendments to legislation*

Mr. Jaap Pienaar reported, where after a discussion followed.

Decisions: (1) The Dept. Environmental Affairs and Tourism is responsible for national norms and standards and must therefore gather experts from all 9 provinces to put new legislation in place; and (2) The Eastern Cape representatives must in the meantime update the old Cape Ordinance and circulate to all provinces for comments. This end product must then be sent to the Dept. Environmental Affairs and Tourism.

4.3 *Financial support – cyanide and waterproof capsule*

Mr. Thys de Wet withdrew his request for financial support. However, this matter should remain on the Agenda until new opinions are formed.

4.4 *Research: Jackals/Coyotes*

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal_Version 5.0

The available information should: (1) be discussed during a workshop to eventually compile a policy document; and (2) the various control methods should be demonstrated.

Decision: (1) Two days during the 2008 Bloem show must be set aside for this workshop; (2) The Dept. Environmental Affairs and Tourism will be responsible for the first day, whereby policy matters will be the focus point. This will be a closed session. (3) The Free State Dept. Tourism, Environmental and Economic Affairs will be responsible for the second day, which will deal with the demonstration of control methods. All provinces must be involved. This will be an open day; and (4) Remove from the Agenda.

***4.5** Problem Animal Manual (Best Practice Norms and Standards for Human–Wildlife Mitigation*

The matter consists of three issues, namely: (1) The book "Predators and Farmers' Book" has been rewritten and will be launched at NAMPO during May 2007; (2) Best Practices (guidelines). This process is ongoing in the Western Cape under the leadership of Mr. Hannes Stadler; and (3) Training. The following were pointed out as concerns: (a) The lack of statistics, i.e. how large is the problem of problem animals actually?; (b) Instructors from the Eastern Cape are trained by Free State; and (c) Moving towards an accredited database.

***4.6** Role of the South African National Parks Board (SANPARK)*

A letter must be written to the Minister of Environmental Affairs and Tourism to enquire about the policy of SANPARK with regards to neighbouring wool farmers and what they are doing to rectify the problem and damages of problem animals to the small stock of farmers.

5. Matters for discussion

***5.1** Current status of legislation with regards to problem animal control*

Mr. Johannes Klopper reported. The following is deemed important, namely: (1) Statistics indicating the extent of problem animal damages remains important; and (2) A request was noted that property owners should allow officials on their property. It is however important that such officials are competent and skilful.

Decision: (1) Mr. Johannes Klopper will publish an article in the Wool Farmer to again inform farmers about the latest legislation policy concerning problem animal control; and (2) The National Production Advisory Committee of the NWGA, under the guidance of Mr. Johannes Klopper, will gather the necessary statistics.

5.2 Practical arrangements around the issuing of permits for hunting at night (Eastern Cape)

- *Farmers wanting to hunt at night need to contact the concerned official.*
- *An important condition is however, that such a person (hunter) must be in possession of a permit to hunt at night.*
- *Mr. Johannes Klopper will compile a document pertaining to the impact of misuse of certain techniques during night hunting. Committee members are requested to forward any relevant information to Mr. Johannes Klopper before the end of May 2007.*
- *The importance of training (farmers and hunters) is accentuated and obtaining a license, an important objective.*

5.3 Possible attack: banning of traps

There is a deliberate attack on producers, which could be destructive to the wool and mohair industries. Farmers must therefore be sensitive towards the needs of consumers.

Version 5.0 - Hilo de Waal Version 5.0

Decision: (1) Mr. Johannes Klopper and Mr. Coligny Stegmann will compile a draft; signed by the Chairman and sent to Vodacom (who acts as sponsor of responsible person piloting the campaign.) and (2) The above-mentioned gentlemen will also compile a similar letter, undersigned by the Chairman and sent to Woolworths.

5.4 1080 Issue

Decision: Considering a finding that Magre van Deventer, Uitenhage was not poisoned by 1080; this matter has now been finalized. The meeting took cognizance that stock of 1080 is no longer available.

5.5 Agri Western Cape

The office will follow up the matter.

5.6 Workshops

5.6.1 *Dept. Environmental Affairs and Tourism must organize a workshop addressing problem animals.*

5.6.2 *The Ganzekraal document must be distributed to all representatives.*

5.6.3 *Practical workshops are the task of provincial authorities.*

5.7 Representatives on National Problem Animal Policy Committee

Invitations must be sent to NERPO and NAFU for nomination of representatives on the Committee.

5.8 ALPRU

Prof. HO De Waal gave a short report. More information will be available shortly.

6. Next meeting

During the 2008 Bloem Show.

7. Closure

The meeting adjourned at 15:00."

On 10 May 2007, Prof. HO de Waal gave a presentation[779] on the Canis-Caracal Programme to the National RPO Congress at the Buffelspoort ATKV Holiday Resort, Gauteng Province.

On 20 June 2007, Prof. HO de Waal gave a presentation[780] on the Canis-Caracal Programme to the Free State RPO Congress at the Vanilla Sky, Bloemfontein, Free State Province.

On 3 August 2007, Prof. HO de Waal gave a presentation[781] on the Canis-Caracal Programme at an NWGA Problem Animal Information Day on the farm Woodview, Arlington, Free State Province.

On 8 August 2007, Prof. HO de Waal gave a presentation[782] on the Canis-Caracal Programme at a Workshop, University of the Free State, Bloemfontein, Free State Province.

[779] De Waal, HO, Gunter, Quinette, Avenant, Nico & Combrinck, Willie, 2007. Die Canis-Caracal Program. Nasionale RPO Kongres. 10 Mei 2007. Buffelspoort, ATKV Vakansieoord, Gauteng Provinsie, Suid-Afrika.

[780] De Waal, HO, Gunter, Quinette, Avenant, Nico & Combrinck, Willie, 2007. Die Canis-Caracal Program. Vrystaatse RPO Kongres. 20 Junie 2007. Vanilla Sky, Bloemfontein, Vrystaat Provinsie, Suid-Afrika.

[781] De Waal, HO, Avenant, Nico, Gunter, Quinette & Combrinck, Willie, 2007. Canis-Caracal Program. NWKV - Probleemdierdag. 3 Augustus 2007. Woodview, Arlington, Vrystaat Provinsie, Suid-Afrika.

[782] De Waal, HO, Avenant, Nico, Gunter, Quinette & Combrinck, Willie, 2007. Canis-Caracal Program. Werkswinkel - Inleidende oorsig. 8 Augustus 2007. Universiteit van die Vrystaat, Bloemfontein, Suid-Afrika.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

The following document was attached to an e-mail received on 21 August 2007 from Mr. Hannes Stadler (Programme Manager: Wildlife Management CapeNature). It is noteworthy to read the very interesting comment by Mr. Stadler regarding "*lack of coordination*" in his e-mail message to Prof. HO de Waal [translation of an e-mail text: "*Attached find a document which will be of interest. It is precisely the issues that we are still grappling with – a lack of national coordination!*"][783'784'785]:

"***The National Problem Animal Policy Committee***

The National Problem Animal Policy Committee (NPAPC) was established at a meeting of Members of the Executive Committees responsible for nature conservation of the (then) four provinces and representatives of organised agriculture on 27 November 1989 in Bloemfontein. It was intended to establish a coordinated national approach to problem animal control between authorities and organised agriculture.

The first full meeting of the (NPAPC) took place on 30 April 1990. It was resolved that it should comprise the four MECs, representatives of the four nature conservation authorities, the South African Agricultural Union, the producers' organisations, the Association of District Councils and the Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism. Regular bi-annual meetings took place up to 1995 where after the meetings were reduced to one per annum.

During the first meeting and the period following it, most of the work was devoted to the gathering and exchange of information to develop a fuller understanding of the situation. The main thrust of the committee followed in the years 1991 and 1992 when the National Policy and Strategy for Problem Animal Control was formulated. This proved to be a protracted process because of the often diametrically opposing interests of the parties involved. Consensus was, however, achieved when the NPAPC adopted the policy on 18 November 1992 in Pretoria. The policy was subsequently approved by the Executive Committee of each of the four provincial administrations and became the official mandate of the NPAPC and its member organisations.

Included with the policy was a strategic action plan, which the NPAPC's members began implementing in 1993. Subsequent meetings therefore included regular assessments and updates of the action plan. Some important milestones were achieved, namely exemption of 1080 used in toxic collars from restrictions under the Injurious Substances Act, improved regulations for the use and storage of cyanide guns, a national accreditation system for problem animal hunters and instructors and the encouragement of private trainers. Many matters still require attention.

After the advent of the new dispensation and the inclusion of the new provincial structures in 1994, the NPAPC resolved to request the new provincial governments to endorse the policy and strategy in order to obtain the mandate of the authorities for the continuation of its work. Some of the MECs of the new provinces endorsed the policy, but others did not respond. The NPAPC continued with its activities and updated the policy in September 1998 to effect minor improvements. It still wishes to obtain wider acceptance of the valuable contribution it can make to reconcile the needs of small-stock farming and biodiversity conservation within the framework of South Africa's conservation policies.

Inter-Provincial Problem Animal Damage Control Committee (IPADCC)
Record of Decisions Taken

[783] The National Problem Animal Policy Committee - an e-mail received on 21 August 2007 from Mr. Hannes Stadler (CapeNature).
[784] A brief reference to this meeting of 27 November 1989 in Bloemfontein is made in section 1989.
[785] Editor's Note: This document is logged chronologically under 2007, but it refers to a series of important meetings on predation management spanning the period 1989 to 1999.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal

Name of Committee:

The name of the committee was decided at a meeting in Kimberley on 28 November 1995.

Functions of the Committee:

(Decisions taken on 28 November 1995)

- *Inter-provincial co-ordination of problem animal control and related functions.*
- *To serve as a liaison forum.*
- *To formulate and recommend national policy and guidelines.*
- *To exchange technical information on problem animal control.*
- *To make recommendations to the National Problem Animal Committee.*

Uniform PAC Legislation:

(Recommendation made on 28 November 1995)

The committee recommended that the provinces should apply the following principles in an attempt to achieve uniformity of PAC legislation between the provinces:

- *Problem animal status should not be assigned to any species.*
- *Species causing damage must be dealt with by way of hunting proclamations and translocation policies.*
- *Only control methods and illegal hunting methods should be regulated by way of legislation.*
- *The PAC hunter must be regulated, for example: a person who receives remuneration for hunting problem animals must attend a course presented by a nature conservation authority.*
- *Hunt clubs should not be compelled to abide by administrative prescripts nor should landowners be compelled to join PAC hunt clubs. The legal right of these clubs to access any property should be repealed.*

Uncoordinated translocation and rehabilitation of vervet monkeys and baboons: A submission by the IPADCC

At the IPADCC's meeting held in Kimberley on 30 May 1996 the uncoordinated translocation and rehabilitation of vervet monkeys and baboons across provincial boundaries was discussed. The Chairman of this committee was instructed to communicate the following recommendations to the Chief Executive Officers of the provincial nature conservation authorities and to the Sub-Committee on Bio-diversity of the Committee for Environmental Coordination.

The IPADCC acts in an advisory capacity to the Chief Executive Officers of the provincial nature conservation authorities on matters relating to problem animals. The uncoordinated translocation and rehabilitation of primates has various implications that can directly and indirectly affect negatively the conservation of these species in South Africa.

The Committee is particularly concerned about the following aspects:

1. *The genetic 'mixing' of geographically separated populations.*
2. *The spread of diseases to wild populations in other provinces.*

Guidelines to ensure that the standard of nature conservators' instruction in problem animal control is maintained at an acceptable level

(Recommendation made on 27 March 1996)

Problem Animal Control as a subject, not only deals with broad theoretical principles, but must also, of necessity deal with the recommended practical methods. The main objective of a nature conservator – who instructs others in problem animal control (PAC) – must be to influence the attitudes of his or her students in such a way that wildlife

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

damage will be minimised and control methods used humanely in the most selective and cost-effective way.

It is crucial for the achievement of the above objectives that nature conservators are credible when instructing others in PAC. This credibility can only be achieved if the officer has good theoretical as well as practical knowledge. A real problem, however arises when the officer is not involved with PAC on a regular basis – theoretical knowledge can fade and practical expertise may be lost.

It is therefore recommended that officers responsible for presenting formal PAC courses on behalf of their provincial conservation authority must meet the following minimum requirements:

(a) they must be qualified nature conservators or nature conservation scientists (or other posts approved by the head of the relevant provincial authority) with no less than two years working and/or practical experience.

(b) they must be in possession of certificates from a provincial conservation authority, which certify that they have successfully completed a formal PAC training course.

(c) they must have presented or successfully completed a PAC course within the last three (3) years. Should a three-year period have lapsed, officers will again be required to successfully complete a PAC course before presenting a course themselves.

***September 1999**"*

The Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism (DEAT) decided to ride the tide and convened a National Workshop for Provinces on Human-Wildlife Conflict Management at the Ritz Restaurant in Sea Point, Cape Town on 27 and 28 August 2007[786]. The agenda was broader, the Workshop was clearly intended to capitalise on important outcomes of the Ganzekraal Workshop, which was held on 10-13 April 2006.

In preparation for the Workshop, a draft document was provided by e-mail to invited participants: "*National Environmental Management: Biodiversity Act, 2004 (Act 10 OF 2004): Human-Wildlife Conflict Management ("Damage-Causing Wild Animals") in South Africa Regulations.*" This showed the intent of the Minister of Environmental Affairs and Tourism to make regulations relating to Human-Wildlife Conflict Management in terms of section 97 of the National Environmental Management: Biodiversity Act, 2004 (Act No. 10 of 2004).

The agenda for the National Workshop for Provinces included the following aspects:

<u>Day 1: Monday 27 August 2007</u>

- Mr. Hannes Stadler presented an introduction - "*National perspective: Background to the development of 'National Norms and Standards for the Management of Damage-causing animals (DCA's)' in South Africa*." This topic was broken down in "*Record of decisions taken by the Inter-provincial Problem Animal Committee of the 1990's – General principles regarding the management of DCA's*" and "*2006 Ganzekraal Workshop*".
- Mrs. Magdel Boshoff (DEAT) briefly alluded to the "*TOPS regulations with reference to listed DCA's*".
- On the broad topic of "*Management of DCA's in Provinces: Legislation/policies/primary DCA's and control methods*" representatives of the respective provinces made their presentations for the Eastern Cape, Free State, Gauteng, KwaZulu-Natal, Limpopo, Mpumalanga, Northern Cape, North West and Western Cape Provinces.
- Three NGO's have also been invited to attend the Workshop and gave short presentations, namely: (i) Mr. Tim Snow - "*EWT*"; (ii) Mr. Thys de Wet - "*Animal Damage Control Institute*"; and (ii) Prof. HO de Waal – "*Canis-Caracal Programme*" (ALPRU).

[786] National Workshop for Provinces. National Norms And Standards for Human-wildlife Conflict Management. Record of Discussions 27 & 28th August 2007. Ritz Restaurant, Sea Point, Cape Town.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

- Most of the afternoon was devoted to discussions and feedback on the work group discussions.

Day 2: Tuesday 28 August 2007

- Summary of previous day proceedings.
- Discussions on "*Proposed draft document*".
- Work group discussions: "*Where to now?*"
- Way forward.

In his presentation, Prof. HO de Waal (ALPRU)[787] alluded to the paucity of reliable data on predation and the extent of livestock losses in South Africa and emphasised the focus of the CCP (Canis-Caracal Programme). He acknowledged the producers' organisations (NWGA, RPO and SAMGA), their concerns as well as support for efforts to mitigate the impact of predation on livestock. It was very important to include these three producers' organisations, as well as the wildlife ranchers (Wildlife Ranching SA), in any initiatives to find meaningful and practical solutions. Furthermore, the management of predation must be accepted as a national activity and priority and the key role players must assume their primary (but not sole) responsibilities: (i) government - policy, research, coordination, training and monitoring and (ii) farmers – protect their animals and reduce impact by controlling predators.

On the second day, the following document was distributed at the Workshop:

"***NATIONAL WORKSHOP FOR PROVINCES***

National Norms and Standards for Human-Wildlife Conflict Management

RECORD OF ISSUES LISTED

27 August 2007

LANDOWNER RELATED ISSUES

1. Issue of compensation w.r.t. DCA's escaping from PA's (in & outside) and causing damage to people and possessions etc.
2. W.r.t. 1. what are reasonable steps to be taken by landowners?
3. Hunting with dogs vs. dogs as DCA's.
4. The use of foreign clients to hunt (TOPS) DCA's >> I.D of those spp.
5. "Do not ignore snotsiekte etc" > remember we are busy with HWC Mgt.

CONSERVATION SCIENTIFIC ISSUES

1. What about buffer zones around PA's?
2. Can one use geographical "zoning" to set standards for specific spp./animal and type of farming"
3. Capture/translocation/re-location as an alternative? What is the impact?
4. Should'nt "overprotect" certain spp – What about unchecked breeding > culling, killing with gin traps etc.?
5. Use and disposal of poison?
   a. Issue of permit by Dept. Health
   b. Joint provincial decision on poison to draft into legislation
   c. Must have alternative before ban completely
6. To what extent – degree of severity can we go beyond the species and get to individual animals?

[787] De Waal, HO, Avenant, Nico, Gunter, Quinette & Combrinck, Willie, 2007. Canis-Caracal Programme. DEAT National Workshop for Provinces. Human-Wildlife Conflict Management. 27-28 August 2007. Ritz Restaurant. Sea Point, Cape Town, South Africa.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

a. communication
b. training
c. incentives
d. co-operative governance

7. Do we support "good traps = humane gin traps " vs. "bad gin-traps"?
8. What to do about research gap in South Africa?
a. All DCA's
b. Large predators
c. Mega-herbivores
9. What is the animal in "DCA"?

CONSERVATION MANAGEMENT ISSUES

1. Listed vs. non-listed spp./individual animal causing damage
2. Issue about "humane killing" principles >>> try and get consensus across provinces
3. Issue about feral/vagrant dogs and whether or not Nature Conservation can declare them as DCA's? Impact on communities?
4. Proper + accredited training in HWC. Control methods and operators
5. Getter is a firearm. Are we complying with other legislation?
6. Empowering provisions for conservation agencies to draft/revise their legislation
7. Different provinces have different DCA's > different Norms and Std's for specific DCA's and generic guidelines
8. Is there an onus on conservation agencies to inform landowners and to what extent should they go. Should it be legislation? > compliance regulated > landowner obligation and response
9. Beef up record-keeping on HWC events and individuals
10. What about the marine/freshwater DCA's?"

The draft regulations for Human-Wildlife Conflict Management specifically related to "*Provisions relating to damage-causing animals*", but with clear "*adherence to the provisions of the Threatened or Protected Species Regulations with reference to nationally and provincial listed animals causing damage*." However, it was clear that the black-backed jackal and caracal were among the wildlife included as TOPS, despite strong lobbying that these two species should not be listed under TOPS.

An electronic copy of the Draft DCA regulations, which was distributed to those invited to the Workshop for discussion on 27 and 28 August 2007, but within days, it inevitably found its way to other role players, including a few wildlife ranchers. This drew sharp reaction and in an e-mail to DEAT, dated 30 August 2007, Wildlife Ranching SA (WRSA) stated its disappointment with the content of the Draft DCA regulations and suggested several important changes:

> "*Our biggest disappointment is the fact that the impression is created that DEAT (or the author of the DCA document) once again does not accept that wildlife on a game farm has a value equal and higher than domesticated animals. Therefore the "author" has decided to take damage to wildlife specimens out of the definition. Furthermore he refers to a holistic approach, which once again in the content that it is used, denies the Game Farmer it's rights to protect its game on his own farm where the game and the land has been paid for by the owner. (The bigger picture is the "poor" DCA has a right to be there and to eat. What about the "poor" landowner?)*"

It was public knowledge that Prof. HO de Waal and ALPRU were assisting the Free State Provincial Chamber of WRSA in addressing various challenges, including matters relating to African predators. Therefore, as a matter of curtesy the electronic input of WRSA to DEAT was also copied to ALPRU, with the request to respond directly to DEAT with a copy to WRSA.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

On 5 September 2007, Prof. HO de Waal responded to WRSA, confirming that he has attended the DEAT Workshop in Cape Town as an invited participant and that the draft document referred to was a "*first attempt by officials and thus merely a working document*." Following the discussions at the Workshop a structured and revised document would be circulated for comment to a wider audience. Management of human-wildlife conflict comprises more than the management of predators. In accordance with its objectives, ALPRU actively caucused at the Workshop for the urgent inclusion of producers' organisations (e.g. NWGA, RPO, SAMGA and WRSA) to speed up the process of predation management and gain wider or more inclusive buying in on the initiative. Ostensibly, these principles were well received by officials at the Workshop with the prospect of being included in the next draft document.

This interaction between WRSA, DEAT and some participants at the Workshop of 27 and 28 August 2007 emphasised a very important aspect: different role players have not yet been included in the initiative to develop and implement a comprehensive and all-inclusive system of coordinated predation management in South Africa.

Indeed, as suggested a more detailed "Record of Discussions"[788] was provided by e-mail on 7 September 2007 to the persons who have attended the Workshop.

On 7 November 2007, Prof. HO de Waal gave a presentation[789] on the Canis-Caracal Programme at an NWGA Problem Animal Information Day at Van Stadensrus, Free State Province.

On 8 November 2007, Prof. HO de Waal gave a presentation[790] on the Canis-Caracal Programme at an NWGA Problem Animal Information Day at Zastron, Free State Province.

On 14 November 2007 Prof. HO de Waal gave a presentation[791] on the Canis-Caracal Programme and predation management at Woolworths DC, Centurion, Gauteng Province.

A copy of a so-called "final draft" of the National Environmental Management: Biodiversity Act, 2004 (Act 10 of 2004): Human-Wildlife Conflict Management (Animal Damage-Control) in South Africa began circulating in the public domain on 10 December 2007.

It soon became clear that the process to draft the DCA regulations was confounded with a concurrent process by DEAT to draft relevant TOPS regulations, because on 14 December 2007 DEAT published the "*National Environmental Management: Biodiversity Act, 2004 (Act 10 of 2004): Threatened or Protected Species Amendment Regulations. The Minister of Environmental Affairs and Tourism hereby publishes non-substantive amendments to the regulations published in Government Gazette No. 29657, Government Notice R.152 of 23 February 2007 as set out in the Schedule below*."

The confusion created unintentionally by DEAT in running the two processes concurrently and also without ensuring the necessary or insufficient incorporation of important key role players, impeded both processes for a number of years to come.

[788] National Workshop for Provinces. National Norms and Standards for Human-Wildlife Conflict Management. Record of Discussions. 27 & 28th August 2007. Published 7 September 2007.
[789] De Waal, HO, Avenant, Nico, Gunter, Quinette & Combrinck, Willie, 2007. Canis-Caracal Program. Roofdierbestuur. 7 November 2007. NWKV Inligtingsdag Van Stadensrus, Vrystaat Provinsie, Suid-Afrika.
[790] De Waal, HO, Avenant, Nico, Gunter, Quinette & Combrinck, Willie, 2007. Canis-Caracal Program. Roofdierbestuur. 8 November 2007. NWKV Inligtingsdag Zastron, Vrystaat Provinsie, Suid-Afrika.
[791] De Waal, HO, Avenant, Nico, Gunter, Quinette & Combrinck, Willie, 2007. Canis-Caracal Programme. Predator Management. 14 November 2007. Woolworths DC, Centurion, Gauteng Province, South Africa.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

2008

CapeNature (Western CapeNature Conservation Board) and the Landmark Foundation (Not-For-Profit organisation - NPO 039416) jointly announced on 1 February 2008 a new integrated partnership in predator conservation. The Landmark Foundation was operating in the western region of the Eastern Cape since 2004. The communique stated that a formal Memorandum of Understanding would govern the partnership between CapeNature and the Landmark Foundation.

On 5 March 2008, Prof. HO de Waal gave a presentation[792] on the Canis-Caracal Programme to the Visrivier Agricultural Association, Eastern Cape Province.

On 12 March 2008, Prof. HO de Waal and Dr. Nico Avenant met in Pretoria with Me. Sonja Meintjes, Acting Director: Biodiversity & Conservation and other officials of DEAT (Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism). In an UFS/ALPRU presentation, Prof. HO de Waal[793] highlighted the complexities and reality of predation in South Africa.

The NPAPC met in the boardroom of Senwes in Bloemfontein on 24 April 2008[794]. The agenda included the following topics:

- No minutes could be sourced, but it appears that the following persons attended: Mr. Petrus de Wet (Chair, NWGA), Mr. Arnold Brand (President RPO), Dr. Amie Aucamp (NWGA), Mr. Coligny Stegmann (SAMGA), Mr. Thomas Mbedzi (DEAT, Snr. Environmental Officer: Policy), Mr. Mpho Tjiane (DEAT), Mr. Dave Kleyn (EWT), Prof. HO de Waal (UFS/ALPRU), Mr. Johannes Klopper (NWGA, Mpumalanga), Mr. Douglas Calldo (NWGA, Western Cape) and Mr. Jaap Pienaar (Eastern Cape Environmental Affairs).
- Apologies were received for Tim Snow (EWT), Thys Delport (Western Cape RPO), Jan Louis Venter (NWGA, Free State), Andre Strydom (Cape Wools SA), Dr. Kas Hamman (CapeNature) and Nico Laubscher (Northern Cape Nature Conservation).
- A motion of condolences was accepted on the tragic passing away of Mr. Hannes Stadler, CapeNature on 31 December 2007.
- National Policy regarding problem animal control. Mr. Mbedzi reported on the interprovincial workshop, which was held by DEAT (Ritz Restaurant in Sea Point, Cape Town - 27 & 28 August 2007). The Chairman requested that a copy of the draft document be made available to role players for comment. Mr. Thys de Wet expressed concern about the impact of the policy on the small livestock industry and suggested the policy must provide for training and research needs as well as being included in the budget.
- A message from Mr. Tim Snow was read regarding "*Best Practice Manual for Wildlife Conflict Management*"; the Afrikaans copy of the booklet "*Predators and Farmers*" was with the printers. Mr. Johannes Klopper expressed his concern that the new version focussed on "*alternative management*" while the focus in older versions was on "*damage caused by problem animals and this was illustrated by photos*"; this important information must not be lost.
- The NWGA drafted a document "*Best Practice Reference Manual for Wool Sheep Farming in South Africa*" and farmers will be requested to sign a code of conduct. The booklet included a section on "Predator Control'. More input was invited on the content of the booklet

[792] De Waal, HO, Avenant, Nico, Gunter, Quinette & Combrinck, Willie, 2008. Canis-Caracal Program. Roofdierbestuur. 5 Maart 2008. Visrivier Boerevereniging, Ooskaap Provinsie, Suid-Afrika.
[793] De Waal, HO, Avenant, Nico, Gunter, Quinette & Combrinck, Willie, 2008. Predator management in the context of biodiversity and conservation. Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism. 12 March 2008. Pretoria, South Africa.
[794] Agenda: Meeting of the National Problem Animal Policy Committee – 24 April 2008, Senwes, Bloemfontein.

Version 5.0 HO de Waal, Version 5.0

and the Chairman said the booklet was the best news in the wool industry in the past few years.

- The concerns of the Western Cape Predator Control Working Group regarding among others a need for a "*trustworthy database indicating losses by predators*", the misperception of the "*public that stock owners are apathetic towards predators*" must be rectified. According to Mr. Douglas Calldo many farmers are abandoning sheep farming because of big stock losses; a farmer has lost 382 of 400 lambs. Mr. Calldo expressed his concern that there was a lack of expertise to manage the effect of problem animals and find a solution for the challenge; it must be discussed at the highest level because it is affecting food security.
- Mr. Johannes Klopper stated that people currently involved in problem animal management are paid for each animal killed; this situation is unacceptable for the "*greenies*" and resulted in the killing of any member of a species and not necessarily the problem animal. He suggested that DEAT must employ experts and pay them a salary; if only one problem animal was killed per month, the effect will be bigger than killing any predator. These problem animal control officials can also be responsible to collect statistics of real losses, identify research needs and act to resolve problems in areas as the need arises; a list of experts must be compiled. Mr. Klopper requested that this issue must be discussed at the highest level with government.
- The meeting noted a resolution taken by the NWGA Eastern Cape Annual Meeting objecting to DEAET having issued permits to introduce warthog (*Phacochoerus africanus*) in the Steytlerville/Willowmore districts without consulting the neighbouring landowners. The DEAET was held responsible for the negative financial implications and requested to accept responsibility for the procedural/administrative error, develop a plan to sort out the existing problem of wild warthog populations in the districts and guarantee that this type of error will never happen again.
- Mr. Johannes Klopper reported on the meetings with Woolworths where problems from both the producers and consumers point of view have been discussed; follow-up meetings will be held.
- A considerable number of articles on problem animal control have been published in the "Wolboer"; channels have been created for farmers to share information and expertise.
- A workshop to discuss implementation of a "*Green Label for Red Meat Production in South Africa*" was planned for 3-4 July 2008 at the Gariep Dam under coordination of Mr. Tim Snow; Dr. Amie Aucamp requested that NWGA production advisors must attend.
- According to current firearm legislation, getters are classified as firearms and must be licenced as such. It was requested that the getter be removed from the Firearm Register; Messrs. Hannes Blom and Lourens Goosen were requested to draft a letter in this regard to Ms. Esmé Jacobs who will issue a formal letter to Mr. Bothma at the Firearms Register.
- The meeting resolved that an urgent meeting must request to meet urgently with the Minister of Environmental Affairs and Tourism to discuss issues which have been raised at the meeting. It was resolved that the Chairman may release the following general communiqué:

"To Whom It May Concern

The annual meeting of the National Problem Animal Forum was held on 24 April 2008 in Bloemfontein. This open forum comprises representation from most role players interested in and affected by damage causing animals. The forum has identified the following issues and decided on a plan of action:

(i) We recognize that the livestock industry in South Africa is being negatively impacted by predation of problem animals and the cost to the industry is in excess of R900m per annum. To put it in perspective the livestock losses due to stock theft are in the vicinity of R300m per annum. The government, through SAPS (stock theft units) and Department of Justice is allocating resources to the stock theft problem but very little is being done to curb the effects of predation on livestock. This problem must be addressed urgently.

Version 5.0 - Vic de Waal - Version 5.0

(ii) South Africa has a policy to secure production of food and fibre for its population and for export. This is being threatened by the impact of predation on the livestock industry by mainly black-backed jackal (Canis mesomelas), caracal (Caracal caracal) and vagrant dogs. Other African predators are also responsible for losses but the above are responsible for most of the losses.

This has been an ongoing problem in Southern Africa and the human-wildlife conflict and the impact of these animals is well documented over the past 370 year history of farming with livestock in Southern Africa. Many farmers, regardless of being a small or large stock farmers or a commercial or communal farmer, are forced to abandon century old practices as a result of the escalating impact of predation. The challenge posed by predation is clearly out of control. Our country obviously cannot afford the impact of the problem.

(iii) Over our 370 year history of dealing with the impact of predation many policies and plans of action have been put into practice by the governments of the day. Some to good affect and others less affective.

(iv) The meeting has decided that an urgent meeting must be requested with the Minister of Environmental Affairs and Tourism (DEAT) the honourable Mr. Marthinus van Schalkwyk. Members from the forum to attend this meeting will be

- *Mr. Petrus de Wet, President of the National Woolgrowers Association of South Africa (NWGA), a farmer from Queenstown EC and the Chairman of the Problem Animal Committee. He will head the delegation and make a presentation to the honourable Minister.*
- *Mr. Arnold Brand, President of the Red Meat Producers Organization of South Africa (RPO) and a farmer in Malmesbury WC.*
- *Mr. Laurie Bosman, President of Agri South Africa and a farmer in Ermelo MP.*
- *Prof. HO de Waal, Manager of the African Large Predator Research Unit (ALPRU) and an Animal Scientist at the UFS Bloemfontein.*
- *Mr. SK Makinana, Board Member of Cape Wools South Africa (CWSA) and a communal farmer from Ugie EC.*

The following points have been identified and must be taken up with the honourable Minister:

1. *The impact of predation will be illustrated with statistics.*
2. *Different policies still exist between provinces and a uniform policy regarding predator management must be identified and implemented by the provinces.*
3. *The lack of an official budget from DEAT, which suits the enormity of the problem and dedicated to conduct research and development in the field of problem animals, specifically the identified species.*
4. *The lack of an official budget from DEAT which suits the enormity of the problem and dedicated to the effective training of producers and predator control operators in combating the impact of the problem.*
5. *The serious shortage in skilled people to train producers and DEAT officials. It is also recognized that these skills is not distributed evenly across the provinces. All skills and resources must be combined within DEAT, the Department of Agriculture (DoA) and private sector to speed up the process and to disseminate and direct these scarce skills to where it is needed.*
6. *The coordination and means to address the problem lay with two departments namely DEAT and DoA and in most cases there is a lack of communication between these departments regarding the problem.*
7. *The development and implementation of a national policy on predator management must be initiated with the full participation of both provincial and local governments and all three tiers accepting co-responsibility in addressing the problem.*

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

8. It is perceived that larger and dedicated budgets were allocated in the past to the problem and thus the impact of predation was smaller.

9. ALPRU, through its Canis-Caracal Programme, is currently gathering existing information and conducting research on predator management and this knowledge must be utilized.

10. Recently (August 2007) a meeting was held at the Ritz Hotel in Cape Town where a draft document was prepared on the control of animal damage. This draft document must be made available to all members of the forum for their input as a matter of high priority and urgency.

11. The permission granted by DEAT to move some wildlife species to areas adjacent to livestock farming areas without sufficient consultation with organized livestock producers has a very negative impact on livestock farming.

12. It was noted that over the past few years DEAT officials attended the National Problem Animal Forum in Bloemfontein but that certain provinces are now not attending the forum any more. It is our wish that it to be policy of DEAT that all provinces attend the annual forum held in April of every year.

Petrus de Wet, National President NWGA of SA."

- Finally: several speakers referred to the same agenda being on the table year after year. In conclusion, the Chairman Mr. Petrus de Wet agreed and asked: "*What is the future of this group?*" In simple terms: *"…are we going to tread water or are we going to embark on a more focussed route?*" It was generally accepted that "things", namely the future of this grouping must change for the better.

Following the annual NPAPC meeting on 24 April 2008 in Bloemfontein, a delegation met on Thursday 31 July 2008 in Pretoria with the Minister of Environmental Affairs and Tourism, The Honourable Mr. Marthinus van Schalkwyk. Mr. Fundisile Mketeni, Deputy Director-General, accompanied the Minister: Biodiversity and Conservation and Mr. Riaan Aucamp, Head of the Ministers Office. The individuals representing the organised livestock farmers were: Mr. Petrus de Wet, Chairman of NPAPC (the President: NWGA and a farmer from Queenstown), Mr. Arnold Brand, President: National RPO (a farmer from Malmesbury), Mr. Laurie Bosman, President: Agri SA (a farmer from Ermelo), Prof. HO de Waal (ALPRU; UFS) and Mr. S.K. Makinana, Board Member: Cape Wools SA (a communal farmer from Ugie).

The following points of discussion were on the agenda with the Minister:

- Presentation by Mr. De Wet on problem animal control and DEAT's involvement.
- The impact of predation to be illustrated with statistics.
- Different policies still exist in provinces and a uniform policy regarding predator management must be identified and implemented.
- The lack of an official budget from DEAT, which suits the enormity of the problem and dedicated to conduct research and development in the field of problem animals, especially the identified species.
- The lack of an official budget from DEAT dedicated to the effective training of producers and predator control operators in combating the impact of the problem.
- The serious shortage in skilled people to train producers and DEAT officials.
- The coordination and means to address the problem lay with two departments namely DEAT and DoA.
- The development and implementation of a national policy on predator management must be initiated with the full participation of both provincial and local governments.
- It is perceived that larger and dedicated budgets were allocated in the past to the problem and thus the impact of predation was smaller.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

- The permission granted by DEAT to move some wildlife species to areas adjacent to livestock farming areas without sufficient consultation with organized livestock producers have a very negative impact on livestock farming.
- It was noted that over the past few years DEAT's officials attended the National Problem Animal Forum in Bloemfontein but that some provinces are not attending any more. It was suggested that the DEAT policy should compel all provinces to attend the annual forum held in April every year.

Mr. Petrus de Wet presented provisional data on the extent and impact of predation. The Minister and senior officials were visibly struck, impressed and convinced by the factual presentations. The delegation also made a strong plea that the Minister of Agriculture and senior officials of the National Department of Agriculture (NDA/DoA) become part of the initiative seeking for sustainable solutions.

Mr. Petrus de Wet was untiring and persistent in maintaining the momentum by engaging at the highest levels with role players, politicians and officials of the departments of agriculture (DoA) and environmental affairs (DEAT).

In an effort to maintain the momentum of the initiative, which was created on 31 July 2008 with the Minister, the delegation also met on 30 November 2008 with senior DEAT officials in Pretoria. However, it was again unfortunate that neither the Minister of Agriculture nor any senior officials of DoA were present. Nevertheless, the senior officials of DEAT were requested again to include representation from the livestock industry in the envisaged initiative to draft regulations on damage-causing animals.

The continued non-participation by DoA officials in matters relating to predation management was becoming problematic and even considered by some as an intolerable situation.

An objective of the CCP (ALPRU) is to collect available data and information on predation management in South Africa. Gunter (2008) conducted the first study in the CCP's ongoing initiative and excerpts from the study are quoted below[795]:

> *"The study focused on monthly hunt reports of two problem animal control clubs in the Mossel Bay district of the erstwhile Cape Province, namely the Cooper Jagklub and the Mosselbaai Sentrale Jagklub. These reports were the most complete set of data retrieved by ALPRU and also covered a substantial period from 1976 to 1992."*
>
> The software developed in the study highlighted *"several important issues and shortcomings in the dataset, namely:*
>
> - *The historical monthly hunt reports and especially the way in which the data were recorded, were never intended for further analysis.*
> - *Positive identification of the specific locations of farms proved to be especially difficult and time-consuming.*
> - *The data were incomplete regarding specific information which prevented definitive conclusions being drawn.*
> - *The format in which data regarding predator control activities is recorded and reported needs to be improved.*
> - *Despite the shortcomings in the dataset, the software proved very valuable in analysing major aspects of predation and predator control activities."*
>
> With the aid of the computer programmes developed in the study *"the following factors can be analysed separately for more in-depth studies on damage-causing animals:*

[795] Gunter, Quinette, 2008. A critical evaluation of historical data on two damage causing predators, *Canis mesomelas* and Caracal *caracal.* M.Sc. dissertation. University of the Free State, Bloemfontein, South Africa.

Version 5.0 - H.O. de Waal - Version 5.0

- *different classes of different domestic animals killed by predators*
- *different classes of different predator species killed in animal damage control operations*
- *different animal damage control clubs, or selected groupings, or geographical areas*
- *different animal damage control operators (usually referred to as problem animal hunters)*
- *different methods used in animal damage control operations."*

Therefore, *"The monthly hunt reports used in the past by official animal damage control clubs were not very useful in creating a clear understanding of how animal damage and animal damage control activities influence each other. This may in part be ascribed to the inadequate design or format of the monthly hunt report."*

In conclusion, Gunter (2008) stated:

"*It is important that computer software such as this be utilised with current data sets to improve the fragmented and uncoordinated predator management activities in South Africa. It may assist in identifying best practices regarding methods and procedures of predator management with a view to reduce the impact of predation on the livestock industry."*

Sometime during 2008, Mr. Niël Viljoen, a predation specialist, started recruiting and developing so-called 'demonstration/monitor' farms in the six predominantly wool sheep provinces, namely the Western Cape, Northern Cape, Eastern Cape, Free State, KwaZulu-Natal and Mpumalanga. The project was initiated and conducted in close cooperation with the NWGA. The focus was active monitoring and collection of data on small livestock losses and predators killed, while serving as demonstration sites for Mr. Niël Viljoen to conduct information courses as part of a broader predation management programme. Over time, Mr. Niël Viljoen conducted a large number of information sessions and reached a substantial number of livestock farmers, their farm workers and predation hunters in South Africa. In subsequent years summaries of progress was reported at annual meetings of the NPAPC.

2009

A National Workshop was convened by DEAT on 27 January 2009 at the Colosseum Hotel in Pretoria to initiate a process to draft National Regulations to Manage Damage-Causing Animals (DCA) in South Africa. Officials and a broad group representing civil society attended the Workshop.

At the Stakeholder Workshop Prof. HO de Waal stated that he was representing ALPRU and at the specific request of Mr. Petrus de Wet, Chairman of the NPAPC he represented Mr. de Wet. Furthermore, at his insistence the three livestock industries represented on the NPAPC have also been invited to the DEAT Stakeholder Workshop, namely SAMGA (Mr. Coligny Stegmann), RPO (Mr. Gerhard Schutte) and NWGA (Mr. Johannes Klopper). Its President, Dr. Gert Dry, represented the fourth sector represented in the NPAPC initiative, namely the WRSA.

Except for the apology for Mr. Petrus de Wet, none of this important information was captured in the official draft minutes of the Stakeholder Workshop, which were distributed on 24 February 2009.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

Mr. Neil Jones, representing PACASA, drafted his personal views[796] of the Workshop. His views (dated 5 February 2009) were distributed before DEAT's official draft minutes were circulated; excerpts regarding his views of the main presentations are quoted below:

"*The welcome by the Chairman gave us a good insight into what we were facing. I don't remember all the participants but here is a list of the more significant ones: Animal Rights Africa; Endangered Wildlife Trust; NSPCA; Landmark Foundation; "Concerned citizen"; DEAT; CHASA; SA Wingshooters; National Problem Animal Policy Committee; Various provincial authorities; Woolgrowers association; Read meat producers association; The Leopard Conservation Project (I think); and Wildlife Ranchers of SA (WRSA).*

I do not know how some of these associations came to be there, if I had known it was a free-for-all there are a few associations I would have liked to get there. No mention was made of the extra organisations and how or why they were there, I suspect DEAT would have accepted anybody in order to be seen to be open.

The first point the Chairman made is that the draft norms and standards that were circulated last year were off the table. To use his words "the document does not exist". What bothers me is that the representative from EWT disclosed that he and Hannes Stadler from Cape Nature had been working on that document for several years. Humbly, if that is the best they can do in several years I am worried about what will come out in the short timespan we have been given to start again.

The meeting then listened to 3 presentations on acceptable methods. First was by Dr Hamman. The core of his presentation was that man has disturbed the ecosystem to the point that we have removed all the super predators (lions etc.) as well as all the large herbivores, and now man fulfils the role of super predator and livestock have replaced herbivores. His main contention is that killing smaller predators is not a solution to the problem and that prevention through non-lethal solutions is the way to go. Killing should become a last resort.

Next we had a presentation from the Landmark Foundation, basically making the same claims but with some case studies of non-lethal methods being used. What was interesting is that the studies they showed had only been running for 2 years, later on the representative from the woolgrowers association stated that in his experience Jackal and Caracal adjusted to the methods after about 3 years and the losses experienced started climbing again. What I found concerning was that in a presentation being made to a room full of (presumably) authorities on the subject much use was made of quotes from newspapers from the 1950s, and the claims and statements made in those days were taken as representative of current thinking.

They also went beyond DCAs and mention they felt that there should be 76 mammal species protected by listing as TOPS because they are commonly hunted. Forgive me but I don't know anybody who has hunted mongoose, aardvark, aardwolf, honey badger, bush baby, polecat, genet …. The list is nonsensical and the reasoning given shows a total lack of understanding of hunting or of the intention of TOPS.

The claim made by both these presenters was that despite all the killing of small predators there numbers are actually increasing. Effectively they claimed that if anything killing was increasing their numbers, because for example breeding was not being controlled by the dominant animals. I would have loved to ask whether they thought increasing livestock numbers i.e. easy food source had any part to play, and also the reasons given appeared only to apply to jackal. In fact to go further, these two presentations focused almost solely on Jackal, even to the exclusion of Caracal.

[796] Report (by Neil Jones dated 5 February 2009) on the workshop on Acceptable Methods for Management of Damage Causing Animals held on 27th January 2009.

Version 5.0 – Hoole Wash Version 5.0

The third presentation was by Prof de Waal of National Problem Animal Policy Committee, which to me was the most balanced of all. Unfortunately I do not have a copy of his presentation to refer to but he tackled the various types of control methods available and the pros and cons of them. He also told us about some telephonic research he is conducting on quite a large sample of farmers, asking them what livestock the farmer had, the losses suffered and what the loss was attributed to. My overall impression was that his presentation was based on practicality, not ideology.

Thereafter the meeting went into discussion mode with David Sutherland as the facilitator. After much deliberation and disagreement it was decided to focus on the types of lethal and non-lethal control available and whether they should be allowed, restricted or prohibited. Here I will suggest we wait for the minutes for a full record of all the methods as I did not note them all. Some topics evoked heated debate and no doubt will be extremely contentious.

The following are some examples, not in any particular order:

Leg hold devices

Gin traps, soft traps etc. A demonstration of soft traps was given but despite the fact that the traps jaws did not cause immediate damage it was stated (mainly by EWT) there was a high likelihood of injury through the animal struggling to escape.

Dogs

By the time this topic came up most of the organisations that had made their opposition to dogs known had left. They had claimed that dogs will kill up to 20 "innocent" animals for every one of the target species. I made the point that these were not properly trained dogs as the purpose of dogs is to bay the animal until the handler can get there, not to kill. I feel CHASA is going to have to make a very strong case for allowing dogs because I believe EWT, NSPCA, Animal Rights Africa et al will scream blue murder when they see dogs on the list. I will organise information to back our point up. Interestingly the Free State Nature Conservation official came out in support of dogs in that he stated that when all other methods fail putting a dog on the scent will get you your DCA every time.

Poisons

This included coyote getters/gif skieters. This was the closest we came to real agreement, nobody really wants poison. However, here the Free State NatCon pointed out that coyote getters are about the only way to get a brown hyaena as they have large territories and do not respond to calls so hunting is extremely difficult.

Hunting

This as with most other methods focused on jackal and caracal, but I did point out that there are other DCAs out there that require different hunting methods. There is a danger here though that this will be forgotten. In respect of Jackal there was a call for only "top professional" hunters such as Heinrich to be used for this purpose because cowboy hunters who go out in the field on a Saturday night after a few beers only end up educating Jackal through their indiscriminate use of lights and calls, creating so-called super-Jackal. In principle I agree with the idea but the mechanisms need to be put in place first. How many of these top guys are there currently and can they hope to deal with the problem if they alone are allowed to do the hunting? Can they train other hunters and grow the pool of hunters? Who will do the accreditation? I also wonder about how much of this cowboy hunting goes on, most farmers I speak to are just as aware of this problem and so I wonder how much this actually happens.

Here I must express a note of self-interest. PACASA does not have professional hunters – hunters who hunt for financial gain – because conducting a business in hunting is a different type of accreditation under the FCA. In fact this was the subject of a conversation between myself and Dir Bothma when we were trying to become accredited, he thought we hunted for financial gain and so could not accredit as a hunting

Version 5.0 . HO de Waal . Version 5.0

association. Consequently we would be opposed to any requirement where DCA hunting would be restricted on this basis.

Anatolian dogs

Strangely, I think this is going to be a very controversial subject. The sheep farmers claim that these dogs will kill anything, in fact they will do more damage than hunting for example. The farmers claim the dogs cannot differentiate between a fox scavenging off afterbirth and a jackal trying to kill a sheep/lamb and would kill the foxes on a large scale. EWT claimed that this should not happen, that was a "failed dog", these dogs should never kill. This to me will be the key to how we argue for hunting with dogs – if EWT can claim that a properly trained Anatolian sheep dog will not kill then they must allow us to claim a properly trained pack dog will not kill."

The official draft minutes of the Stakeholder Workshop (held on 27 January 2009 in Pretoria) was distributed by DEAT on 24 February 2009[797]:

DRAFT MINUTES

[Slightly edited re format and spacing]

DISCUSSIONS ON ACCEPTABLE METHODS FOR CONTROL OF DAMAGE CAUSING ANIMAL (DCA) –STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOP

COLOSSEUM HOTEL: 27 JANUARY 2009

CHAIRPERSON: MR BONANI MADIKIZELA

NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION
1.	Opening and Welcoming	The Chairperson opened the meeting and welcomed all the delegates and further apologized for the delay and tendered an apology for Mr Fundisile Mketeni who was supposed to chair the meeting. He also apologized for the delay caused by technology which led to 2 hours delay.
2.	2.1 Apologies 2.2 Attendance	Mr Fundisile Mketeni (DDG: DEAT); Sonja Meintjes (DEAT); Herman Els (National Shooting Association); Lorraine Kretzschmar (Taxidermy Association); Jacques Malan (WRSA); Andrew Rossaak (WESSA); Petrus de Wet (NWGA/NPAPC); Rynette Coetzee (EWT); Wadzi Mandivenyi (DEAT); Jan van Niekerk (SAHGCA); Molefe Mokoene (NAFU). Attendance Register Attached.
3.	Adoption of the Agenda	The Chairperson requested to move item no. 7: Presentation by Cape Nature to item no. 4: Presentation by Landmark Foundation and was adopted as such.
4.	Purpose and rules of engagement by: The Chairperson	The Chairperson informed the meeting that the purpose of the workshop was to initiate a process of finding acceptable methods of managing Damage Causing Animals (DCA's), in the process of incorporating these methods into the draft norms and standards to be published for public participation in terms of NEMA section 100. **Background** • DEAT was requested by Working Group G1 to develop DCA control legislation • Development of N&S was in accordance with NEMBA processes (consult, publish, implement) Discuss approach (principles): Considerate (respect viewpoints); Objectivity (factual, no emotions); Realistic (compromises); Practical (simply, implementable, **partnership**); Conservation of biodiversity; Support food security; Flexibility and change management. Definition for DCA – needs review (ARA and Dr Smuts)
5.	Presentation on acceptable methods for control and managing DCA: By Dr Kas Hamman	Dr Hamman highlighted the following: **Seek consensus on:** • Predators still do cause stock losses - Damage still caused • Conservation Authorities (CA) still have major role to play – advising land owners • CA must work with land owners – information dissemination - ethically and morally justifiable • Land owners also have responsibility – manage the animals – morally and ethically **CA should:**

[797] Draft Minutes – Discussions on acceptable methods for control of damage causing animal (DCA) – Stakeholder Workshop, Colosseum Hotel: 27 January 2009.

Version 5.0 - HO Cowell - Version 5.0

		• initiate research programs – gather data and make justifiable recommendations to farming community • We need better data • CA should participate more in extension programs • CA should participate training – hunters, land owners • CA should base control on legislation, acceptable to industry and other role players Criteria for DCA control: humane, ecologically acceptable, selective, legally accepted system (N&S) Definitions: • Home range • Territory Over utilization – removal of herbivore layer, replaced by other layers brought in by humans (e.g. livestock), then large predators removed, only small predators left, and man replaced large predators = changed ecosystem Role of predators – remove sick/ injured animals – prevent spreading of diseases in natural system, etc. **Social behaviour of predators:** • Large territories • Dominate over small predators • Removing predators create vacuum • There is always presence of predators with role to play **CA should preach holistic approach:** • Prevention = better than cure: • More intensive management • Do not use marginal areas for grazing • Collars • Control – remove correct individual selectively. How? • Get relevant information • Focus on the animal that causes the damage, and if necessary, remove that animal • Must be Cost effective – if control is more expensive than stock = not profitable • Reality – inhumane methods still used: gin traps not attended for weeks on end, poison **Summary:** What can be done to minimize? • Selectivity • Alternative methods – Anatolian shepherd dogs, flashing lights etc • Manage stock more intensively • Use other animals e.g. donkeys • Help govt to find alternative methods **NB**: **Please refer to the attached presentation for more details.**
6.	Presentation on acceptable methods for control and managing DCA: By Dr Bool Smuts	Dr Smuts highlighted the following: **Introduction** Traps/ snares/ leg hold devices = still inhumane, unselective, unacceptable Control methods relate to legislation **Objectives of Foundation** • Stability to predator populations • Decrease damage to stock • Increase stock profits • Restore Biodiversity processes • Job creation through management (shepherding) • Continue research and education • Develop market mechanisms • Guide legislation w.r.t. DCA control **Lethal control measures** • Lethal methods are not really working • Started work on black-backed jackal in Madikwe (main culprit) • Damage also caracal, Cape fox, serval, Black eagle, dassies in the 1950's, • History: In 1922 govt sponsored jackal proof fences (300 000km), fencing killed porcupine and other burrowers • 1950's many more jackal • How did we react? More hunters trained, hunting clubs established

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

		• Numbers' of killings are increasing, should tell us something on the increase in populations • What have we achieved in 350 years? • Biodiversity/ prey base compromised • More jackal, caracal • Decrease in Cape fox • Sub-adult breeding of jackal **Lethal methods:** • Dogs – not target specific • Gin traps – damage to animal to extent where euthanasia is inevitable (fractures, etc) • Soft gin traps – animal still fighting the trap • Call and shoot hunt – target specific (spotlight and gun) • Collars with poison – target specific • Poison bait (strychnine) – not selective – secondary poison as result, jackal get resistant to poison **Non-lethal control – methods available:** • NB = detailed assessment (guide book available) • Livestock guarding • Alpacas – consider what category under AIS, and whether AIS should make provision • Do not believe that poison collars are ethical **Case studies: saving money by using non-lethal methods:** • Jansenville 1 farmer: sheep and angora, dogs - saved R97 000 per year • Baviaanskloof 10 farmers – 45 000 ha – dead stop collars - saved R443 500 • Graaff-Reinet – 5000 ha – alpacas and dead stop collars – saved R174 000 **Research results:** • Proposed strategies: • Move away from lethal methods • Lethal only under restricted conditions • Enact legislation to prohibit the inhumane lethal methods (prohibit some, restrict others) What needs was done? • National shepherding body established • Education material on non-lethal methods developed **National Environmental Management: Biodiversity Act** • Problem – only protects listed species (39 mammal species) • Propose listing species commonly hunted (76 species) • WC legislation towards use of gin traps • Hunting notice of 2009 • Therefore propose legislation changes: • Limit lethal methods under strict conditions • Permits on individual case by case basis • Outlaw certain lethal methods – leg hold devices, poison, hunting dogs • Expand TOPS list • Outlaw production and/ or possession of active leg hold devices Change the culture – way/ believes people are brought up with – wearing leopard skin, mass hunting of jackal Promote to farmers to change their management style – protect rather than kill Incentives to farmers who contribute towards conservation **NB: Please refer to the attached presentation for more details.**
7.	Presentation on acceptable methods for control and managing DCA: By Prof. H.O. de Waal	Prof. H.O. de Waal highlighted the following: Mention elephant and buffalo – contained behind fences – do not harm when contained. Predators cause damage – photos of the species mainly caracal and black-backed jackal, also lion, leopard, hyena, cheetah. Large predators are dangerous, and we have the tools to contain them. Predators impact negatively on live stock (sheep, goats and cattle) and game (wildlife ranching). Despite of long time controlling them, still know little about them, still know little about their role in ecology, what is the extent of the damage, how successful is the effort to control them, and to reduce their impact. Lot of scientific information lost in the past. 1971/2 – 1991/2 – majority of problem animals killed was BB jackal (17 697) and Cape fox (51 963).

Version 5.0 - H.O. de Waal - Version 5.0

		Success is not measured by how many DCA killed, but by the reduction of the impact of predation on live stock. Study: National Survey on Impact of Predation (van Niekerk *et al,* 2008). Looked at impact on stock farms. Determined the number of farms to sample per province by looking at the contribution of the province to stock farming. Results indicate that the predators are not stock breed-specific/ selective. Proportions differ i.t.o. which species are responsible for what % damage, but BB jackal and caracal responsible for largest % of damage. Need to include DoA – they look at food production and food security. We must look at the long-term impact of predators on food security. Therefore proposal that DEAT and DoA form partnership with producers. Sufficient info available to ID the correct species and individual that cause the damage. Experience/ skill must be transferred through training. What is the extent of the damage caused by predation? • Need scientific information. To what extent are non-lethal methods used to deter predators? Refer to Bool's presentation. • All the non-lethal methods are effective, but not necessarily continuously effective/without failure. • Therefore no method is ideal/ perfect. • Efforts/ methods must be used in combination/ alternated. • Therefore correct package combined with best practices must be found. How effective are efforts to manage the effect of the impact of predators? Has the specific DCA been identified and eliminated? NB Do not assist in creating cheap negative publicity (hanging carcasses on fences). Farm owners are often not aware of the extent of the problem, due to overlap of territories on adjacent farms. **Information needed:** • Where are the hotspots regarding BB jackal and caracal? (they are probably not equally distributed). • What is the extent of the damage caused annually? • When are the largest problems experienced? Caracal breed any time, BB jackal not. • What measures are applied – lethal and non-lethal? • Are efforts made to reduce the impact through application of non-lethal methods? • How and by whom are lethal methods applied? • Are sustained reductions in losses created after such methods have been applied? **3 basic risk factors impact on stock and game farming:** • Drought – official government financial support/ aid (national, DoA). • Stock theft – Official support/ legal recourse (SAPS Stock theft units, convictions) criminal. • Predation – fragmented and un-coordinated – State? Perception from farmers is that government wants to conserve the DCA more than to assist with the problem. **Predator management is a national priority and activity** Primary (but not sole) responsibilities: • State – policy (mandate), facilitate research, pay for training, coordination of efforts and monitoring outcome (will call on resources). • Framers – right of the owner to safeguard his livestock and manage/ control predators (the farmer does not have to do it himself). • NGO's – must be allowed to play their respective roles. **Way forward:** • Create synergism through broader public/private/ corporate partnerships • Illustrated by moving forward i.t.o stakeholder involvement – Ganzekraal very restricted, Ritz hotel less so, and today inclusive of broad spectrum • Definite need to coordinate all activities w.r.t. predator management on national level in SA: • Coordination must not be confused with control – give credit to partners • Create need for training • Must find the way to coordinate the activities **NB: Please refer to the attached presentation for more details.**
8.	Facilitated discussion	The facilitator proposed the process for the discussions as follows:

Version 5.0 - Hoede Waal Version 5.0

	by: Mr David Sutherland	i. to identify the methods of control currently used, and the advantages and disadvantages of each method and whether they should be restricted or prohibited, and/or ii. identify the species that are most likely to cause damage and work from there, elaborating on the methods used. **a. Discussion** **DCA definition**. The definition of what constitutes a damage causing animal was a contentious issue due to reference to groups of animals or entire species as opposed to individual damage causing animals. A suggestion was made that the definition be refined. The eventual proposal was to circulate the TOPS definition of a damage causing animal as a proposed definition or point of departure. (Attached hereto). **"damage causing animal"** means an individual of a listed threatened or protected species that, when interacting with human activities, there is substantial proof that it - (a) causes losses to stock or to other wild specimens; (b) causes excessive damage to cultivated trees, crops, natural flora or other property; (c) presents a threat to human life; or (d) is present in such numbers that agricultural grazing is materially depleted. **b. Format of facilitated discussion** The format of the discussion was debated with the use of grouping of animals, methods and nature of the loss (damage) being 3 of the proposals. Ultimately it was decided to list the current methods of controlling and managing DCA and then to assess them against the **EISH** criteria, being: **E** = effective, ethical – will it work, and is it acceptable? **I** = impact – what is the impact of the damage on the DCA? **S** = Selective – is the method selective? **H** = Humane – is the method humane? (added: Legality – is it legal?) The proposal of listing the lethal methods followed by the non-lethal methods, the methods would then be listed as restricted or prohibited was adopted. The agreed that all non-lethal methods should be considered before resorting to lethal control. **i. Lethal - purpose(intent) is to kill the animal** **aa. Poison – toxic collars, baits** The general consensus was that poison that intended to be ingested by an animal should not be allowed, poison that was delivered from a poison collar should however be permitted since it qualified in terms of the **EISH** principles. There were also some reservations of use of this method. **bb. Traps – leg-hold devices or snares** There was consensus that snares should not be allowed. A lively debate on the use of gin traps ensued with a section of the meeting arguing that it was a lethal method since the use of the device ultimately and inadvertently led to the animal's demise while others argued that the intention was not to kill the animal with use of gin traps – Consensus on the use of gin traps was not reached. **cc. Coyote getters** These devices are controlled under legislation (Firearm Control Act.) as well as the poisons that they employ. They are already prohibited in certain provinces and it was suggested and accepted that their use should be prohibited with the strict exception of provincial DCA control officer's, but prohibited for use by private individuals. **dd. Shooting (rifle or bow)** Shooting as a control method by the landowner was supported. If the control (Call and shoot) was however carried out by a private person for commercial purposes, such as person would have to be accredited to carry out the control. **ee. Dogs** It was argued that dogs could be a very useful tool in controlling, particularly a wary individual DCA that was difficult to control by any other means. It was further agreed that if dogs were used that the packs should be very well trained, be registered with an appropriate association and that only certain types of dogs were to be used. Another key requirement in the use of dogs was that a dog be permitted to be used as an aid to tracking and baying but under no circumstances was the dog to be used as an attack animal. An example of greyhounds which tend to be unselective as well as attack animals was cited. The requirements of TOPS which prohibits the use of dogs should also be borne in mind. **ff. Denning**

Version 5.0 - HOD 23 (Final - Version 5.0

		It was agreed that it would be inhumane to kill adult animals and then to leave the pups in the den. It should be permissible to kill adult or juvenile adults in the den subject to certain requirements, the use of fire, barbed wire etc, should be prohibited. **ii. Non-lethal - purpose (intention) to capture the animal** **aa. Trap cage** Trap cages should be permissible, their use should however be carried out in accordance with strict requirements (conditions). **bb. Darting** Should be allowed to be used in emergency situations only bearing in mind the requirements to use the drugs (Veterinary Act).DEAT to further engage the Vet Council on the legality of this issue. **cc. Electric fencing/ fencing** Fencing was acceptable as a method of DCA control. The requirements of such fences should however be prescribed since they could lead to the death of species such as pythons, pangolins and tortoises. Furthermore, the method has topographic limitations, as well as its effectiveness especial with jackals. **dd. Guarding animals (Anatolians, Alpaccas, donkeys etc.)** The use of guarding animals was positively accepted by all the participants, there were however the following reservations: a. that poorly trained animals hunted wildlife b. that poorly trained animals strayed c. that the DCA was killed anyway, making this a lethal method in the case of dogs. It was suggested that an association of guarding animal should be established which could control, assess and train guarding animals for this purpose. It was further stressed that this method is effective in combination with other methods. **ee. Collars** Examples of these collars include, Dead stop collars, king collars, bell collars and cell phone collars. The deterrent device is used to prevent biting, make an unnatural noise or alert to excessive movement. There were no objections to the use of these collars, the reservation was however expressed that the DCA's get used to or alter the form of attack (rear end) when these devices are used for an extended period of time. **ff. Repellants/ scare tactics ,Geo-fence and geo-collars** These methods relates to the use of sirens, horns and radios etc to scare DCA animals' away when triggered by an electronic or other device. Their use was accepted with reservations. These methods didn't receive thorough discussion due to time constraints. **ff. Use of kraals/ enclosures** It was suggested that the use of well constructed kraals could limit access to livestock during vulnerable times such as lambing or during the night. **General comments**: General but important comments received during the workshop were as follows: 1. The discussions focused entirely on livestock on private land, a concern that communal land was not being addressed was tabled. (Sam Makhubela, Limpopo) 2. A concern that DCA should include any wild animal which spread diseases was raised (Dr Gert Dry) and meeting objected to this concern since domestic animals could infect wild animals with, for example bovine TB. 3. A concern was raised that the white farming community which is well resourced was present, but that we also need to be talking about other communities, such as SANParks/ communities adjacent to national parks. (Michelle – ARA) 4. A concern that farmers were being too restricted in terms of the DCA control methods that they were permitted to employ was raised. 5. A serious concern with regard to the turn around time for permits in the case of DCA's was raised. A system whereby the issue of such permits could be expedited should be in place and should be implemented. 6 Research and training (landowners etc.) need to be prioritized. 7 Accredited training providers (current expertise) need to be identified for training with regard to DCA control methods. 8 Do not take too many methods away and leave the farmers with very limited options to control DCA. This may lead to people in using underground unacceptable control methods. Therefore, all farmers would be criminals. 9 The farmers are the custodians of their own land. We provide options to deal with DCA. If the farmer phones with request for advice, what time limit will be provided for to assist the farmer with the relevant advice of what method to use? DEAT offices do not have the capacity to assist with all the control problems, therefore need to look at other possibilities such as standing permits for DCA control bodies, exemption from permit

Version 5.0 - HC Approval - Version 5.0

		requirements under certain circumstances, etc. Requirement of a TOPS permit for DCA control poses a big problem at the moment, as potential damage is immediate and turn-around time of permits currently is not satisfactory. 10 DoA needs to be involved in this issue. 11 What about other vertebrates (primates) not discussed today? The purpose of today's meeting was to discuss methods applicable to any DCA, not only predators. 12 The capacity of government to respond to incidences where questioned.
9.	Way forward	The Chairperson proposed a small task team to continue working with these N&S due to time constraints since it needs to be finalised by March 2009. The task team will work via e-mail, to draft a document and distribute to members of the meeting. The task team comprising of the following peoples was formulated: Mr Bonani Madikizela DAET; Dr Kas Hamman, Cape Nature; Dr Bool Smuts, Landmark Foundation; Prof. H.O de Waal, National Problem Animal Policy Committee; David Sutherland, Workshop Facilitator; NSPCA; Mr Tim Snow, Endangered Wildlife Trust; Dr Gert Dry, Wildlife Ranching South Africa, and DoA. Timeframes: 03 February 09 – to provide a draft chapter of the N&S document 09 February 09 – comments on the draft document from the meeting representatives **Priorities:** • Education and Training • Research and development
10.	Closure and concluding remarks	The Chairperson thanked all delegates for their concerted effort to find solution on the acceptable methods for control and management of DCA. The meeting was declared close at 18:00.

Prof. HO de Waal gave a presentation regarding predation management[798] on 27 January 2009 at the DEAT Stakeholder Workshop.

As indicated in the draft minutes of the Stakeholder Workshop it was delayed, in fact it was delayed for about 2 hours. A debate must have taken place behind closed doors, but at least one participant noticed a possible reason for the delay. It is of interest to note the statement made previously on 5 February 2009 by Mr. Neil Jones: "*The first point the Chairman made is that the draft norms and standards that were circulated last year were off the table. To use his words 'the document does not exist'.*"

In the open forum a participant verbally objected that he has allegedly been excluded him from events leading to the Stakeholder Workshop. He insisted that the previous draft document be ignored and since he is now present, the process should start with the proceedings arising from the Stakeholder Workshop.

Mr. Heinrich Funck, a well-known specialist predator hunter in South Africa, also drafted his personal views of the Stakeholder Workshop dated 26 February 2009[799]; translation is quoted:

> ***"General:***
>
> *The Workshop was convened by inviting different stakeholders. The most important group, namely the landowners/users to whom the legislation would have the most impact was not represented except for the NGWA and Cape Mohair & Wool. This was specifically emphasised in the presentation by Prof. de Waal.*
>
> *The legislation drafted by CapeNature was not used as basis for discussion; instead presentations by Dr. Kas Hamman, CapeNature, Dr. Bool Smuts, Landmark Foundation and Prof. de Waal, Large Predator Research Unit (ALPRU)/National Problem Animal Policy Committee served as basis of discussions.*

[798] De Waal, HO, 2009. Predator management in the context of production, biodiversity and conservation. Workshop on acceptable methods to manage and control damage causing animals. 27-28 January 2009. Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism. Colosseum Hotel, Pretoria, South Africa.
[799] Notas Heinrich Funck re DEAT- DCA werkswinkel gehou te Coloseum hotel op 27 Januarie 2009.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

Although the Workshop dealt with the spectrum of problem animals (Damage Causing Animals) the first two presentations only focussed on predators; only Prof. dealt with all the facets. Specific detail of these presentations is noted below.

Dr. Kas Hamman - Ecological Principals and Holistic Approach to Damage Causing Predators:

In short, it was said that farmers/land owners are not managing and utilising the veld correct, therefore, wildlife and natural prey are reduced or exterminated and instead the farmers have started farming with livestock, which became the sole prey of predators and the resulting conflict.

The different role players have specific responsibilities, for example nature conservation authorities "have a duty to advise landowners who practice agricultural activities that are not always compatible with the ecological requirements of natural ecosystems in any given area" and also the land owner/user to reduce or eliminate losses as part of the production process.

The nature conservation authorities must: conduct research, participate in programmes which are focused, effective, ecological and ethical acceptable; provide training; provide equipment when the private sector cannot comply, such as cage traps; draft legislation which can conserve ecosystems and species and regulate control practices; and always work with the agricultural sector and against them.

The criteria for problem animal control must comply with the following standards: humane; ecological acceptable; selective; and legal/approved.

Dr. Hamman said the problem has been with us more than 350 years and efforts to eradicate the black-backed jackal and caracal have failed, thus we are doing things seriously wrong.

According to Dr. Hamman, the function of predators is inter alia to: remove sick and injured animals from the system and prevent the spreading of diseases; remove carcasses of dead animals; control rodents and other prey animals; and serve as indicator of the well-being of a system.

In a natural ecological system: predators control the movement and distribution of the same species which in turn reduce livestock losses; predators keep other predators out which reduces livestock losses; and restricts the breeding of predators as a result of territorial behaviour.

Dr. Hamman said there must be change to a 'Holistic approach' in farming under the motto 'Prevention is the cure' and to use non-lethal methods to prevent losses. If a problem animal has to be removed, it must be the culprit.

Dr Bool Smuts - with a contribution by Rob Harrison-White:

They stated upfront that the Landmark Foundation is totally against the killing with any deadly method. They support the research carried out by Mr. Harrison-White at the Madikwe National Park on black-backed jackals and a few case studies where farmers have changed to a holistic approach.

Mr. Harrison-White used media reports of the 1950s and specifically the Landbouweekblad of 1955 and 1956 showing that the problem existed then and that something has been done wrong because problem animal numbers have been increasing. Data of different hunts clubs also showed that the numbers of problem animals increased constantly.

In reality, Dr. Hamman and Dr. Smuts both followed the same line. In short, it meant that if predators are left alone they will regulate their own numbers and the dominant animals will keep other predators away from and area, which will reduce breeding and in turn reduce livestock losses.

Version 5.0 - Hodgewart Version 5.0

Prof. H.O. de Waal:

To my (Heinrich Funck's) humble opinion, this was the most balanced presentation. Prof. de Waal also included all animals and did not concentrate on predators only. According to data analysed by Prof. de Waal the annual livestock losses ascribed to black-backed jackals and caracals in South Africa exceeded 1 Billion Rand.

He also referred to the paucity of training and research. The predation losses are more than livestock theft; for the latter there are specialist units who can seek the culprits and deal within the legal provisions. Droughts are natural phenomena where official intervention and support are rendered, but again does not apply for predation losses. He pleaded that the government should accept its responsibility in this regard and that all role players and stakeholders be involved in the processes.

Prof. De Waal emphasised the legal right of the land owner/user to protect his property. There is room for both non-lethal and lethal methods, but training and education is of paramount importance in the use of both types of methods. He also emphasised that equipment cannot be described as unselective, but the user makes it unselective. Thus, human factors contribute to the unselectively of methods. He referred to Oranjejag where the long time it took from receiving information on predation losses to its response in handling the problem, contributed to its demise. It cannot be expected of any farmer to wait 3-4 weeks before his problem is being attended.

He strongly objected to the tactics of some organisations to use cheap publicity in furthering their case; specific reference was made to the photographs being used by the Landmark Foundation on their website and elsewhere.

Prof. de Waal stated that this challenge would not be successfully resolved without the cooperation of farmers, landowners and users.

After the presentations were made the subject was discussed:

It was obvious the anti-hunting group was intent to have all lethal methods banned based on the information and research emphasised in the first two presentations. It was decided to list and discuss the control methods in terms of ethics, humaneness, effectiveness, selectivity, etc.; then the meeting will decide which must be banned and which can be used as regulated methods.

The following methods were listed:

Lethal: *poison; foothold traps; hunt/shoot; breeding den handling; and hounds.*

Non-lethal: *livestock guardian animals/herders" such as hounds, Alpacas, etc.; cage traps; barriers, kraals, fences, electric, etc.; deterrents, odours and alarms; and Herd management, kraaling animals, lambing coordination.*

The following proposals were listed to which attendees must provide comments; these in turn will be submitted to a nominated task team (see later) for recommendations by 11 February 2009.

Lethal methods which were discussed:

- *Poison – to place poison or scatter poison out is totally unacceptable; poison can be used in livestock protection collars and coyote getters - in special circumstances.*
- *Foothold traps – no consensus was reached on the use of these devices. One group regarded it as barbaric and unselective while the other group maintained it can be used selectively and was very necessary in the control of problem animals and for catching animals to conduct research.*
- *Shoot and hunt (night hunting/calling included) – Must be regulated for trained professionals only; upon accreditation a trained person must be allowed to conduct the profession without restriction.*
- *Handling of breeding dens was considered acceptable because when the parents*

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

have been shot the pups cannot be left to die of dehydration.

- *Hounds – it was proposed that hounds may be used to 'flush, point and bay', but may not be used to attack and maul animals during the hunting problem animals. It must be subject to very strict standards and regulating.*

I want to add that Falconry and hunting from an aircraft/helicopter were not listed as methods of problem animal control and will be listed in the next round of comments to the task team.

Non-lethal methods which were discussed:

- *Livestock guarding hounds – a controlling body must be established to oversee the correct selection of hounds and appropriate good training is provided.*
- *Cage traps – training must be provided and the method regulated because cage traps can be set incorrect and not visited and inspected regularly.*
- *Electric fences – it was noted that method which is regarded as being 'green' results in the killing of thousands of tortoises. Further investigation was need.*

In general:

Training and research were identified as the two main shortcomings. The property of wildlife ranchers, namely the animals are not yet included in legislation and must be urgently addressed.

The minutes will be finalised by a task team of eight (8) persons and distributed by 3-4 February 2009 where after the other input must be made by 11 February 2009.

This is only a preliminary report and may have several shortcomings. I have drafted it from memory and what I have observed. If my interpretation differs from the presenters, I am apologising in advance. The minutes will be provided soon and I will distribute it to you.

A few thoughts on the different presentations.

Dr. Kas Hamman put great emphasis on the holistic approach as embodied by the 'PREVENTION IS THE CURE!' in the Proceedings of a Workshop on Holistic Management of Human-Wildlife Conflict in the Agricultural Sector of South Africa, which was held in 2006 at Ganzekraal.

It is my humble opinion that the whole holistic approach is based on perceptions and unfounded statements and that research in this regard will be of cardinal value to substantiate or refute the perceptions and views.

I hold the same humble view regarding the information provided by Dr. Bool Smuts and Rob Harrison-White.

I qualify my view as follows:

The arguments rely on the concept that predators will regulate their own numbers. Mr. Harrison-White for example cited from his research in the Bloemhof district that is a constant number of jackals and that they are controlling their own numbers; the same applies to Madikwe. I have accompanied Mr. Harrison-White in the area and on about 4 000 ha 17 jackals were called in that night. It means one jackal per 235 ha.

In the areas where I currently operate the population is about two jackals per 3 000 to 5 000 ha. It means we can expect an influx of about 19 jackals in the area before it will stabilise for example in the 5 000 ha area. This is 425 jackals for every 100 000 ha. In a natural area, such as Madikwe the jackals are still more scavenging animals than in the Karoo and because of injudicious use of poison in the past the jackals have developed an aversion to their natural behaviour to take carrion. If the jackals are not taking carrion naturally in the Karoo, what will be their prey base? What will be their impact on the environment regarding indigenous prey/wildlife given the number of jackals and what will their impact be on livestock losses.

Version 5.0 – Clean Version 5.0

Dr. Smuts dealt with case studies of individuals in different areas. It is common knowledge that if a farmer applies preventative methods/deterrents he will have success because the jackals are simply shifted to neighbours where the will prey on lambs. The figures presented by Dr. Smuts were impressive but cannot be taken as being representative of a large area. Research is urgently needed to evaluate the concept in an area larger than 250 000 ha (this point was also emphasised by Prof. de Waal).

Every farmer that uses preventative methods must know it will only have temporary success. As soon as his neighbours are doing the same, the adaptable jackals will start attacking sheep from behind; as a result, many badly mauled and injured sheep have to be put out of their misery.

Mr. Harrison-White showed information from the 1950s. It is common knowledge that in the Karoo and other parts of our land there were at a stage no or very few jackals. It meant that a generation of farmers have grown up that knew nothing or very little about jackals. It was a period of about 25-30 years. It was a long-term solution. Any information given about the loss to biodiversity during that period is based on guesswork. It is a fact that large parts of the small livestock regions still have a low predator population and the results of forced legislation based on a holistic approach, which is not scientifically researched, will cause damage and the impact may be much worse than any current way of managing farming activities.

There is a logical explanation for the large number of jackals and the continuous growth in numbers. A large number of farms changed from small livestock to wildlife. Wildlife ranchers have a greater tolerance for jackals than small livestock farmers do and the numbers stated increasing to fill the existing vacuum areas. Professional people have also purchased many farms and ***some do not have any problem animal control program*** *and accept the losses because they have another source of income (take note I am not generalising). Many smaller farms have also been purchased and run as a natural ecosystem, which in the greater scheme of things cannot be regarded as a natural system. These areas became the breeding sources for jackals, which then cause losses for the bona fide farmers. National Parks do not apply any control and in some areas in the parks there are no natural ecosystems because the large predators are absent. The jackals become overpopulated in these areas and migrate to outside the parks. It is interesting to see that in particular farmers in the immediate vicinity of National Parks, areas where no control is applied and wildlife ranches where no control is applied are the first to complain and to experience problems.*

If one million ha in the Karoo has two jackals per 5 000 ha then there are 400 jackals in the area. At the norm of one jackal per 235 ha (as determined near Bloemhof) then there is a vacuum for 3 855 jackals to fill the area. It is my humble opinion that it is unacceptable to use incomplete research and perceptions to take ill-considered decisions and force it on others.

I do not think there is a single farmer who does not want to practice conservation and apply it and none who do not want to make a profit. It is however, irresponsible to take decisions, which may have the opposite result than what is really intended.

I trust you find this input acceptable and soon provide a report. In the meantime, input can be invited regarding the different lethal control methods and the standards to which equipment must comply, as well as levels/standards of training for operators and how it will be regulated.

I am going to use the internet forum http://jaracal.com/index.php under the heading environmental affairs ('Omgewingsake') to get input of hunters and you are welcome to write directly to me at hein@jaracal.com to register on the forum and make input.

Hunter's greetings, Heinrich Funck"

Version 5.0 – HQ de Waal, Version 5.0

As noted in DEAT's official draft minutes of the Stakeholder Workshop, a small task team was nominated from the floor on 27 January 2009 and tasked to edit the draft N&S regulations by 11 March 2009, before being circulated again for broader public participation and comment. The task team would work via e-mail to draft a document and distribute it to attendees of the meeting.

On 2 March 2009, Prof. HO de Waal gave a presentation[800] on the Canis-Caracal Programme and predation management to senior staff at Pick n Pay's head office, Kensington, Gauteng Province.

On 3 March 2009, Prof. HO de Waal gave a presentation[801] on the Canis-Caracal Programme at an NWGA Predation Information Day, Willowmore, Eastern Cape Province. This presentation was at the invitation of Dr. Amie Aucamp, Deputy General Manager, NWGA. The ALPRU/CCP presentation followed on Mr. Niël Viljoen's very informative overview on predation management.

On 4 March 2009, Prof. HO de Waal gave a presentation[802] on the Canis-Caracal Programme at an NWGA Predation Information Day, Aberdeen, Eastern Cape Province. Dr. Amie Aucamp, Deputy General Manager, and NWGA also arranged this event. It became apparent that the order of presentation on the agenda was changed. Ostensibly, the presentation and input the previous day at Willowmore might have been an important catalyst. The ALPRU/CCP presentation was moved very early on the agenda.

The NPAPC decided to take the lead and convened an Open Forum on 20 March 2009 in Port Elizabeth[803]. It was chaired by Mr. Petrus de Wet (NGWA) and attended by 50 persons as representatives from: NWGA (3); Cape Wools SA (1); Endangered Wildlife Trust (1); KwaZulu-Natal - NWGA (2); Mpumalanga – NWGA (2); Eastern Cape – NWGA (2); Sneeuberg Farmers Association/ Landbou Gespreksforum (1); Agri East Cape (2); Emerging Agriculture Business Chamber + East Cape Agriculture Confederation (1); Dept. Economic Affairs, Environment & Tourism – EC Province (1); Northern Cape - NWGA (1); Dept. Tourism, Environment & Conservation, Kimberley (1); Western Cape – NWGA (2); Lusern & Agri Klein Karoo (1); Prins Albert Agricultural Association (1); Laingsburg Agricultural Association & Landbouweekblad Forum (1); CapeNature (1); Free State - NWGA (2); Free State Department of Tourism, Environmental and Economic Affairs (2); RPO (General Manager, National); RPO Western Cape (1); RPO Eastern Cape (1); RPO Northern Cape (2); RPO Free State (2); SA Mohair Growers Association (1); African Large Predator Research Unit (UFS/ALPRU) (1); Animal Damage Control Institute (1); Peter Schneekluth Problem Animal Control (1); Department Environmental Affairs & Tourism (3); Wildlife Damage Research and Management ; North West Parks & Tourism Board (2); Cheetah Outreach (1); Landmark Foundation (1); LOWFT Joubertina (1); Media: Landbouweekblad (1); Farmers Weekly (1); Wool Farmer (1); and Burger Agric (1).

Version 5.0 - Final Version 1.0

[800] De Waal, HO, 2009. Predator management in the context of production, biodiversity and conservation. Acceptable methods to manage and control damage causing animals. 2 March 2009. Pick n Pay, Kensington, Gauteng Province, South Africa.

[801] De Waal, HO, 2009. Predator management in the context of production, biodiversity and conservation. Acceptable methods to manage and control damage causing animals. 3 March 2009. Willowmore, Eastern Cape Province, South Africa.

[802] De Waal, HO, 2009. Predator management in the context of production, biodiversity and conservation. Acceptable methods to manage and control damage causing animals. 4 March 2009. Aberdeen, Eastern Cape Province, South Africa.

[803] Minutes of an Open Forum meeting of the National Problem Animal Policy Committee held on 20 March 2009 at the BKB Recreational Hall, North End, Port Elizabeth.

Formal apologies were noted for the Honourable Minister Marthinus van Schalkwyk (Environmental Affairs & Tourism); MEC: Mr. Cobus Dowry, Agriculture Western Cape; Richard Schutte, KZN Nature Conservation; Mr. Fundisile Mketeni, Deputy Director General DEAT; Dr. Gert Dry, President of WRSA; and Wayman Kritzinger, Agri East Cape.

The following excerpts are quoted from the minutes:

*"**Presentations by Researchers***

HO de Waal, ALPRU[804]

He presented a slide show, referring to "Acceptable methods to manage and control damage causing animals". The following interesting facts were evident from the presentation:

1) Black-backed jackal and caracal are important larger predator species among the South African wildlife, but they also impact negatively on the South African livestock industry, especially sheep and goats (as well as cattle and wildlife ranching).
2) Success should not be measured by the number of predators killed, but by reducing the impact of predation on livestock.
3) Livestock losses due to predators have a long-term impact on food security and DEAT and DoA must form active partnerships with producers in this regard.
4) Expertise/skills must be transferred through training.
5) No method provides a final solution or can be regarded as the perfect answer to manage predators.
6) Control methods must be combined and alternated.

Conclusion

1) Predator management is a national priority and activity.
2) Primary (but not sole) responsibilities:
a) State (policy, research training, coordination and monitoring) (has the resources).
b) Farmers (safeguarding livestock and managing/controlling predators).
c) NGO's (allowed to play their respective roles).
3) Create synergism through broader public/private/corporate partnerships.
4) There is a definite and urgent need to coordinate all activities relating to Predator Management in SA.
5) Coordination must not be confused with control.
6) Great need for training (skills transfer).
7) Must find a way to coordinate the activities.

ROB HARRISON-WHITE

He does video work mainly to help farmers for training purposes. The main concern is the increase in jackal and caracal populations. Management options include:

1) Lethal methods, which has been well explored, but is generally ineffective. Has also damaged biodiversity.

Problems with lethal management

(i) Has not been effective in addressing predator control
(ii) The most lethal mechanisms are not ethical or humane

2) Non-lethal options – is not generally well explored.

Research has shown that the advantage of having territorial jackal is that it stops other jackal from coming into their territories and share food sources.

THYS DE WET

[804] De Waal, HO, 2009. Predator management in the context of production, biodiversity and conservation. Acceptable methods to manage and control damage causing animals. 19-20 March 2009. National Problem Animal Policy Committee. BKB, Port Elizabeth, South Africa.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

Debate: Does animal damage control fits under Agriculture or Conservation? Although agriculture is the sector that suffers the problem and has undeniable inputs, it is a conservation matter for the following reasons:

- *Wild animals.*
- *Understanding population dynamics of wild animals.*
- *Kruger Park and elephants – culling option allowed – WHY?*
- *Because animals naturally increase when conditions are good.*
- *When "Mother" Nature brings the numbers down in bad conditions, the Habitat and Animals suffer tremendously (drought, fire, flood).*
- *When humans interfere and put fences up WE HAVE TO MANAGE the populations to deal with the increases.*
- *Management of damage causing animals and biodiversity are the function of trained conservationists.*
- *Biodiversity is practiced by letting nature take its course and increasing the number of species present as much as possible.*
- *The failure of SA to properly conserve biodiversity cannot be placed on the shoulders of commercial farming.*

Other facts

1) *Damage causing animals often quickly learn how to overcome non-lethal methods.*
2) *New methods (for the area) often good success but diminish over time.*
3) *When used in few places animals avoid it, but in general use animals challenge, and mostly find ways to overcome the method.*
4) *Methods have to be properly tested over wide areas and for extensive periods before it can be deemed successful. This is why, even the USA with 50+ highly qualified ADC scientists, do not have all the answers.*
5) *Most non-lethal methods have severe biodiversity side effects.*
6) *Most world authorities predict that the human/animal conflict will increase and that it is management systems that have to be applied continuously.*
7) *Greens – accuse farmers and hunters of making money by killing. They themselves get sponsor money – the greener the talk, the more money – however, it is not their livelihood that is being ruined. This is an unethical way of making money.*

TIM SNOW – "Toxins in Human-Wildlife Conflict Management"

Farmers suffer losses caused by wildlife damage – we understand, but in civil society, there are norms, standards and laws with which we must all comply.

There are several pro-active, prevention methods:

- *Environmental management.*
- *Fencing and kraaling.*
- *Guard animals*
- *Synchronised lambing.*
- *Many types of collars.*
- *Lights, sirens etc.*

Toxic killing methods include:

1) *Coyote getters.*
2) *Poison collars.*
3) *Poison baits.*

Negatives of poisons:

- *Method is non-selective.*
- *Method is inhumane.*
- *Mode of action of most toxins.*

Version 5.0 - Hope de Waal - Version 5.0

- *Effect on carnivore ecology and population dynamics.*
- *Environmental hazards and consequences.*

Why do farmers use poisons illegally?

1) *Quick fix, but long term damage.*
2) *Inadequate enforcement.*
3) *Apathy; ignorance.*

What are the solutions?

1) *Education and proper training of farmers on alternative preventative methods. Their use and acceptance?*
2) *Prosecution of transgressors?*
3) *Enforcement of legislation?*

In conclusion

Let's focus on the issue at hand and avoid personal issues. We realise and understand there are problems, but he urges everybody to act responsible (using the control methods). It is also important to engage in the best practices (farm management) and get away from minimum standards.

PETER SCHNEEKLUTH

How to diminish stock losses:

1) *Requires a lot of effort, time, labour and the necessary equipment.*
2) *He has given 450 training courses, which is now CD material for training. His knowledge is locked up in the CD's.*
3) *He makes his living by killing jackal – setting good traps.*
4) *One way of reducing stock losses is the "wurggreep" practice, which is a method that has not failed.*
5) *Poison has a big role to play in SELECTIVE predator control.*

Questions and Comments

1) *Mr. Robert Wilke disagrees with:*

a) *The statement that jackal do not overlap in specified areas where territorial jackal are roaming – that is not his experience. He is further of the opinion that non-lethal methods are of temporary nature.*
b) *The statement that losses are more in areas where control methods are being used – it is his experience that in areas where no control was done, no lambs were weaned, but in the areas where control was administered, lambs were weaned.*

He feels very strong about the fact that should all methods be taken away by regulations and restrictions, farmers would be forced to use poison.

2) *Mr. Piet Lodder, in reaction to the statement by Mr. Tim Snow that 20% of farmers use pesticides illegally, wanted to know if this has been verified and scientifically analysed. Mr. Tim Snow replied that the survey was done in collaboration with the NWGA and that farmers answered an open and frank questionnaire at different farmers meetings in different areas. From a scientific point of view, many farmers did it in confidentiality. It would be interesting to see the change should the survey be repeated.*
3) *Mr. Ernest Pringle directed a question to Mr. Rob Harrison-White and questioned what he based his statement on that "lethal means have been unsuccessful" He referred the meeting to the history of this country whereby in large areas, the black backed jackal were eliminated in the 1960's and for 20 years, small stock farming did extremely well. He also posed the question whether we would be able to feed 80 million people in South Africa in 25 years, and further questioned if we can afford jackal in South Africa.*

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

4) *Mr. Coligny Stegmann also referred to the 1980's where no jackals were found and he is of the opinion that because of the dissolving of divisional councils, this explosion of population is being experienced (divisional councils assisted in the control of the problem).*
5) *Mr. Roger Smith referred to the "National Survey on Impact of Predation" as projected by HO de Waal and is of the opinion that because of the passive state of DEAT, farmers inflated stock theft loss figures and because of the authorities not really knowing; now just accepting the statistics. He wants the role players to start concentrate on the real issues.*
6) *Mr. Nic Zaayman pleaded that available funds not be spent on futile research, but rather training farmers on control methods.*
7) *Rob Harrison-White said that jackal mauling cattle during calving is a management problem. He alleged that farmers are using AI (artificial insemination) and this tends to produce large calves leading to difficult births causing jackals to attack cows. HO de Waal refuted this casual statement. He said AI is not such a common practice in beef cattle production and any combination of bulls and females may inevitably produce some large calves. If these larger calves are borne by females with narrow birth canals, it may lead to difficult births.*
8) *Mr. Boshoff Davel pleaded fiercely that people remove their blinkers and realise that farmers are leaving the industry because of problem animals. They have used all humanly possible methods and the damage causing animals still exist. Statistics and surveys show that sheep numbers have decreased dramatically, BUT STILL people would rather see that smaller animals such as weasels for example, rather be protected. How would you react if somebody takes 60% of your salary – what would you resort to!! He asked. What farmer can afford a R100 000 loss?*
9) *Mr. Gxothiwe reacted by saying that the reason for the jackal problem is the poorly managed game reserves in the country. Service delivery is non-existent in this sector.*
10) *Mr. Robert Wilke said that he started as a young man in the industry and trained many farmers on control methods. He is of the opinion that research has failed and that all energy and efforts be placed in training of all control methods.*
11) *Mr. Hendrik Botha remarked that jackal is even killing his cattle calves, therefore the training in all control methods be a priority.*
12) *Mr. Rob Harrison-White suggested that the involvement of shepherds be investigated. A combined effort by the NWGA, DEAT and himself to train shepherds needs some exploring.*
13) *Dr. Bool Smuts feels that this forum is only a select committee with selected opinions and he has certain contributions to make, which he feels is appropriate, namely:*

a) *There are examples of non-lethal methods which are extremely successful.*
b) *Production results – demonstrations indicate 90% success rate.*
c) *It is irrelevant what farmers and conservationists think – it is what happens at the till.*

14) *Ms. Ann Beckheling briefly informed the meeting of the utilisation of Jack Russel's as an alternative control method for problem animal control.*
15) *Mr. Gerhard Schutte, who represents 35 000 members and have the mandate to represent NERPO, stated that those institutions representing themselves are making the most noise. The only person who can solve the problem is the farmer himself and DEAT, when they look at legislation, should equip the farmer to help himself. He has serious doubt about the continuation of the forum in this format – to maybe consider smaller groups.*
16) *Mr. Bonani Madikizela, Director: Regulation and Monitoring Services informed the meeting about the progress with the draft regulations and norms for damage causing animals, compiled by DEAT. DEAT is not here to eliminate species and balance is*

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 1.0

important. DEAT is here for farmer consultation. They are also fully aware of the concerns of other stakeholders – minority and majority.

With regards to the issue of true statistics, he (Mr. Madikizela) added that it is important to have reliable data, which will be able to stand the legislation process (stand in court).

With regards to conflicting legislation (Ernest Pringle's example of jackal from neighbours), the national office is currently busy developing legislation where after the provinces need to align the regulation, regardless of what the constitution says. Otherwise, we are heading straight into disaster.

The issue about food security is very clear – biodiversity versus food security.

He briefly discussed the guiding policy framework and again confirmed that it is not about eliminating species, but minimising stock losses and DEAT wants to meet the targets of the stakeholders as proposed in the norms and standards of damage causing animals.

IN CONCLUSION – Mr. Petrus de Wet

1) It is important to understand the perspective of the farmer.
2) The participants where thanked for their inputs. The Chairman is convinced that everyone learnt something today and now you need to sit back and make up your own decisions.
3) The statistics speaks for them; farmers testify; THIS MATTER IS OUT OF CONTROL.
4) New research is very necessary.
5) The tools are not the problem; it is the way farmers are dealing with the tools. Therefore, training is extremely important and DEAT must take up their responsibility to educate farmers.
6) It is important to utilise all control methods – it is not the device, but the application.
7) We have the support from DEAT – meeting with Min. Marthinus van Schalkwyk.
8) However, the Department of Agriculture is still absent and they are co-responsible for this issue.
9) No decision will be taken today, but an Action Committee will sit in July 2009 to address this matter, because ultimately this problem is the farmers'.
10) The Chairman thanked all farmers for their input and telephone calls and therefore it is so important to look after their interests.
11) He requested the Media to not turn this into hype and sensation."

At the conclusion of the Open Forum on 20 March 2009, Dr. Amie Aucamp (Deputy General Manager: NWGA) asked Prof. HO de Waal to meet him in an anteroom. Dr. Amie Aucamp enquired why ALPRU was embarking on an initiative similar to what the NWGA is conducting. It transpired the enquiry was prompted by ALPRU's proposal, which had been submitted to Cape Wool SA, RPO and SAMGA on 15 March 2009 for possible funding (R250 000, 2009/10), namely: "*The development and implementation of a coordinated strategy of predator management to reduce the impact of the black-backed jackal and the caracal on the livestock industry*."[805] Dr. Amie Aucamp briefly outlined the NWGA's project. It was clear the two projects were not similar. Prof. HO de Waal explained that ALPRU's proposal was a scientific project that was long overdue. In 2010 it transpired that the inquiry by Dr. Aucamp was linked to an initiative was developed since 2009 at the Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University (NMMU), the so-called "*Concept framework for a cooperative Stock Predation Research Programme in South Africa*"; also referred to by some as the "*Co-operative Research Programme (CRP)*".

[805] On 5 August 2009 Cape Wools SA informed ALPRU that it has awarded an amount of R15 000 to the project.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

Upon leaving the venue after the meeting with Dr. Amie Aucamp, Prof. HO de Waal was awaited at the exit by Dr. Bool Smuts and Mr. Rob Harrison-White, as well as few of their student colleagues, ostensibly to say goodbye. It turned out that both gentlemen experienced the friendly, handshake as aggressive. A few days later Mr. Rob Harrison-White tried to entice Prof. HO de Waal by e-mail into a rather unsavoury electronic debate. On 25 March 2009, Prof. HO de Waal ended the electronic debate and on 26 March 2009 Mr. Rob Harrison-White responded by e-mail in a very uncouth manner. On 27 March 2009, Mr. Rob Harrison-White lodged a complaint with the Vice-Rector of the UFS against Prof. HO de Waal. On 30 March 2009, Dr. Bool Smuts, Director: Landmark Foundation followed suit and also lodged a more formal, but very similar, complaint with the Vice-Rector of the UFS against Prof. HO de Waal.

The UFS and Prof. HO de Waal acted independently and obtained legal counsel to address the serious accusations. The legal counsel of Prof. HO de Waal advised both gentlemen by letter to stop drawing their client into unsavoury debates and refrain from including references to him in correspondence to third parties.

On 27 March 2009, Prof. HO de Waal gave a presentation[806] on the Canis-Caracal Programme to the Livestock Welfare Coordinating Committee in Lynnwood, Pretoria, Gauteng Province.

The Task Team on Damage Causing Animals held a Workshop on 27 May 2009 at DEAT's Head Office in Pretoria; Mr. Bonani Madikizela chaired it. The main points on the agenda focused on assessment of comments and the way forward.

Later the evening of 27 May 2009, Prof. HO de Waal sent an e-mail[807] to the individuals who have been listed as addressees for the Workshop of 27 May 2009: "*Hallo dear all. After today, I have a strong sense that we are gaining momentum and moving mostly in the same directions. Let us keep it up. Thank you for the opportunity to participate*."

On 8 June 2009, Prof. HO de Waal gave a presentation[808] on the Canis-Caracal Programme to senior staff at Shoprite's head office in Cape Town, Western Cape Province. Mrs. Magdel Boshoff (DEAT) and Mr. Gerhard Schutte (CEO: National RPO) accompanied him.

Dr. Bool Smuts of the Landmark Foundation found it necessary to respond on 9 June 2009 (@ 02:43) to Prof. HO de Waal's e-mail (dated 27 May 2009) by distributing an e-mail to a large, but unknown number of recipients; the e-mail message is quoted below:

"*Dear all*

I believe the reference below of the (plural) directions is correct. It is utterly misconceived that these directions are the same. On what basis could such a notion have been entertained at all? It is far fetched to suggest that certainly we at Landmark Foundation supports barbaric practices such as poisons, dogs, helicopter hunting of DCA, slaughter irons/slagysters/ gin traps/ or sickeningly euphemised 'soft traps/devices' (Orwellian newspeak if ever you have seen such rubbish), as agents of NWGA, RPO, their paid advisors, and the game industry wish to support.

On reflection of the meeting, I wish to raise the following issues that I believe makes this process flawed and thus does not carry our support, endorsement or agreement:

[806] De Waal, HO, 2009. Predator management in the context of production, biodiversity and conservation. Acceptable methods to manage and control damage causing animals. 27 March 2009. Livestock Welfare Coordinating Committee. Vleissentraal Board Room, Lynnwood, Pretoria, South Africa.

[807] e-mail message sent by HO de Waal to 24 persons (cc to 3 persons) on 27 May 2009 at 10:20 pm.

[808] De Waal, HO, 2009. Predator management in the context of production, biodiversity and conservation. Acceptable methods to manage and control damage causing animals. 8 June 2009. Shoprite, Cape Town, South Africa.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

1. Please let me formally object how this past meeting was allowed to be dictated by those wishing to promote the ongoing use of the methods that the 11th March meeting agreed to prohibit and restrict. It is also further objected that certain parties were allowed to dominate the meeting and other prohibited from having their requested inputs, and this in the light of agreements that were already reached. It appeared that the meeting was held for the benefit of Mr Malan to raise objections on territory already covered.

2. It is fundamentally flawed to not reconsider a review of the definition of DCA as it stand at present. The current definition is flawed as it panders to the game and agricultural industry by effectively designating all carnivores/predators as DCA. If this is addressed (as the meeting refused to allow discussion thereto), we have a long and tough battle ahead. It seems utterly sinister that this should have been allowed and railroaded through in the meeting. The basis of agreeing to any interim and phase out agreement is fundamentally based on a review of what is termed a DCA. Attempting to subjugate the issue around a flawed TOPS regulation is even more troubling as it will effectively allow the status quo decimation of our biodiversity. This matter does not carry our support, endorsement and will be challenged.

3. *The fear of the media is equally sinister. I believe that there is absolutely nothing to hide, or is there? In a constitutional democracy a free press is our best hope of getting accountable governance. We will thus be happy to account to the people of South Africa for who we act as civil society operators, and thus we should all be accountable to the public.*

4. *Our agreement to have a phase out period of 36 months to see a total ban on all leg holding traps (whether they are referred to as slagysters/gin traps/leg hold devices/soft catch traps etc.) is subject to the following:*

b. *Provided that the definition of DCA is revised, and Tim Snow, as requested at the 11 March meeting, provided a perfectly adequate definition,*

c. *That absolutely no option of allowing any form of gin traps (whatever Prof de Waal suggest they be called) be used beyond the agreed phase out period. (I trust that Prof de Waal is not again allowed to wave around a fundamentally flawed paper by Kamler et al[809] without it being challenged!)*

d. *The interim allows only government appointed and paid 'trappers' to use such (specified) devices over the next 36 months – These devices be strictly controlled, specified, issued and licenced by the provincial conservation authorities, and completely destroyed after this period of 36 months.*

e. *The regulations are to make the possession, distribution, manufacture, use, donation, sale etc of these devises illegal after the 36 months, and all devices not meeting the definition and specifications from the date of proclamation.*

It would appear that Prof de Waal and his industry body paymasters are on an offensive to promote the use of leg hold devices, another unacceptable lethal control methods, to the retail industry at present – meetings are currently under way. In the light of this, it must be stated that unlike Professor de Waal's suggestion below hereto that we are on similar directions, WE ARE MOST CERTAINLY NOT. We do not support unethical, ecologically ruinous, never mind financially unsustainable methods of managing DCA!

I trust that this clarifies our position. We look forward to vigorously engaging this debate.

Kind regards, Dr Smuts, Director, Landmark Foundation"

[809] Kamler, J.F., Jacobsen, N.F. & Macdonald, D.W., 2008. Efficiency and safety of Soft Catch traps for capturing black-backed jackals and excluding non-target species. *South African Journal of Wildlife Research* 38: 113-116.

Version 5.0 - H.Du Toit - Version 5.0

On 10 June 2009, Prof. HO de Waal gave a presentation[810] on the Canis-Caracal Programme and predation management at the Northern Cape RPO Congress, Kimberley, Northern Cape Province.

On 12 June 2009, Prof. HO de Waal gave a presentation[811] on the Canis-Caracal Programme and predation management at the SAMGA Annual Congress in Port Elizabeth, Eastern Cape Province.

On 25 June 2009, Prof. HO de Waal gave a presentation[812] on the Canis-Caracal Programme and predation management at Vrede, Free State Province. The Honourable Deputy Minister of Agriculture, Dr. Pieter Mulder was the main speaker at the event and addressed the topic "*The future of Agriculture in the RSA*." The programme of the Information Day on Small Livestock Farming in South Africa stated that Prof. HO de Waal (ALPRU Project, UFS) would address the topic "*The control of problem animals*." However, the organisers allowed him to change the focus and address the topic "*Acceptable methods to manage and control damage causing animals - Coordinated predation management in the context of livestock production, biodiversity and conservation*." This broad theme was advocated since in many subsequent public presentations in South Africa.

The Livestock and Wildlife Working Group on Damage Causing Animals was founded on 2 July 2009 in Port Elizabeth to provide a united platform for liaison and coordinating activities of the livestock and wildlife ranching industries. This would enable the organised livestock and wildlife ranching industries (NWGA, RPO, SAMGA and WRSA) to present a united front to find practical solutions to reduce the negative impact of predation. The aim of the Livestock and Wildlife Working Group on Damage Causing Animals was to reduce predation losses by means of ecologically and ethically acceptable methods, which protect the biodiversity of South Africa. It endorsed an approach, which was scientifically based, biologically sound, environmentally safe and socially responsible. The minutes of the founding meeting on 2 July 2009 in the Board Room of SAMGA in Port Elizabeth is quoted below:

> *"Attendees: **NWGA** - Petrus de Wet (National President) (Chairman); Bom Louw (KwaZulu-Natal); Thys Delport (Western Cape); Johannes Klopper (Mpumalanga); SK Makinana (Cape Wools SA); Andre Strydom (Cape Wools SA); Leon de Beer (General Manager); Amie Aucamp (Deputy General Manager); **African Large Predator Research Unit (ALPRU)** - HO de Waal; **Agri Eastern Cape** - Wayman Kritzinger;* **RPO** *- Arnold Brand (Chairman); Gideon Vivier (Western Cape); Skillie van Rensburg (Northern Cape); Nic Zaayman (Free State); Albie Jacobs (Eastern Cape); Gerhard Schutte (General Manager); **Mohair Industry** - Gerhard Grobler (Chairman); Coligny Stegmann; Philip Vosloo (General Manager: Mohair Growers Association); Deon Saayman (General Manager: Mohair SA); **Wildlife Ranching SA** - Arthur Rudman and Reinhardt Holtzhausen (Manager).*
>
> ***1. OPENING AND WELCOME***

[810] De Waal, HO, 2009. Predator management in the context of production, biodiversity and conservation. Acceptable methods to manage and control damage causing animals. Northern Cape RPO Congress. 10 June 2009. Horseshoe Motel, Kimberley, South Africa.

[811] De Waal, HO, 2009. Predator management in the context of production, biodiversity and conservation. Acceptable methods to manage and control damage causing animals. South African Mohair Growers' Association. 66th Annual General Congress. 11-12 June 2009. Port Elizabeth, South Africa.

[812] De Waal, HO, 2009. "Acceptable methods to manage and control damage causing animals." Gekoördineerde roofdierbestuur in die konteks van veeproduksie, biodiversiteit en bewaring. Inligtingsdag – Kleinveeboerdery in Suid-Afrika. Oos-Vrystaat Veldramklub en Neuman Broers - 25 June 2009. Vrede Veilingskraal. Vrede, Vrystaat Provinsie, Suid-Afrika.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

Mr. Coligny Stegmann opened the meeting with prayer. The Chairman welcomed all and introduced everyone one another.

2. APOLOGIES

Le Roux Fourie, NWGA Free State; Niel du Preez, NWGA Eastern Cape; Lardus van Zyl, RPO North West.

3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

None.

4. REPORT BACK TASK TEAM

HO de Waal gave a brief background as to where the process started and highlighted events, specifically during 2009. The process is being led by Mr Bonani Madikizela of DEAT. The first meeting was held on 27 January 2009. At the request of the Chairperson of the PAF (Mr de Wet) HO de Waal represented him at the meeting. However, at the insistence of HO de Waal, three of the livestock industries represented on the PAF were also invited and present at the meeting, namely Mohair – Mr Coligny Stegmann, RPO – Mr Gerhard Schutte and NWGA – Mr Johannes Klopper. Another important industry in this initiative, namely WRSA was represented by its President, Dr Gert Dry. At the end of the meeting on 27 January 2009, the Chairperson (DEAT) nominated a Task Team from the floor, which included ALPRU. After many drafts and a lot of objections and conflict, the Norms and Standards for Damage Causing Animals were tabled and edited. At the first meeting of the Task Team, HO de Waal requested that it be minuted that he was "wearing several hats", namely as ALPRU and somehow also on behalf of the PAF as represented by the RPO, NWGA and Mohair. At a later meeting a Sub-committee was nominated with the mandate to come up with a vision regarding research and training. This Sub-committee would convene early in July where after the draft will be circulated to the broader industry. It was envisaged that by January/February 2010 the Norms and Standards should be in place. Based on the norms and standards the long overdue regulations will be promulgated by the Minister.

Johannes Klopper, who is also part of the Task Team and representing the Chairperson of PAF on the Sub-committee, commented that they are privileged to have Bonani Madikizela (DEAT) as the chairperson of the meeting. He is also of the opinion that it is going to take a long time to convince the authorities that tools used to trap damaging causing animals are humane. DEAT will only consider the phasing out of gin traps for example, if alternatives, which are effective, are in place.

Reinhardt Holtzhausen said that a lot has already been achieved because of the industries standing together. It is however important that at the meeting in July, the industries speak in 1 voice. He urged that all organisations request their members to submit individual letters as well as organisational letters to DEAT when commentary is requested for the Norms and Standards.

Gerhard Schutte enquired how the Task Team was constituted because he observed the absence of a representative from the large stock industry. He further wondered how it is possible that 2 persons representing the Green movement are on the Task Team. It is of crucial importance to realise that HO de Waal cannot represent the industry, because he is a researcher – he represents Science. The principle of requesting that an industry representative serve on the Task Team must be put to DEAT. HO de Waal concurred with this view (as suggested in the overview reported above) and as minuted on the programme.

Johannes Klopper explained that the sub-committee, who meets in July, has been tasked to investigate alternative methods and report back to the Task Team. Draft will be sent out for public comments.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

5. COLLECTIVE POLICY "Do we wish to tackle this issue collectively as NWGA/RPO/SAMGA/WRSA?

A unanimous decision by all the industries that the issue be handled in a collective manner.

5.1 National Policy and Strategy for Problem Animal Control in SA

5.2 Forum policy

The policy document was discussed in depth to determine the relevance of the objectives and extensive changes were made. Mr. Andre Strydom was tasked to re-write the policy document and transfer it into a constitution for the new collective body. It will be circulated to the Working Group.

Press releases/Use of Media

It is the request of Mr. Gerhard Schutte that each industry sector speaks on behalf of that industry, but under the general framework of the Forum.

Decision: All press and media related issues regarding DCA will be referred to the Management Committee of the Forum (consisting of 1 representative of each industry). The respective organisations may also handle issues related to the problem that might be unique to their industry, themselves. Individual producers are also free to handle problems to their own discretion should they prefer to do so.

How do we deal with legislation (Norms and Standards)

The same principle will apply as with media and press related issues. Collectively through the Management Committee of the Forum, thereafter each industry will activate its members to respond.

6. COLLECTIVE POLICY re Animal Rights Organisations

The meeting discussed the matter and agreed to the following collective policy:

The Working Group is prepared to cooperate and talk to any individual, group or institution that is committed to positively contribute towards workable solutions to the problem of damage causing animals, as well as scientifically accredited institutions and –individuals with research on this matter. The Working Group is, however not willing to liaise or work with any pressure groups, institutions or individuals advocating or promoting boycotts on products produced by members of this group. Members of the Working Group also reserves the right to share a platform with anybody.

6.1 Website design

Mr. Petrus de Wet enquired whether it would be a good idea to include pictures of predation on the website of the NWGA.

The meeting agreed with the procedure. Forum members are requested to send photos on predation on a continuous basis to the Secretariat.

6.2 Mohair SA presentation on proposed TV programme

Mr. David Crichton from No-line Communications made a presentation whereby he provided the Forum an opportunity through a TV programme called "Farmers' Prey" to educate people on predators. The production will be screened on SABC 2 and will consist of 13 episodes. Television to be used as tool for empowering people.

The proposed production was accepted with the following provisions:

1) The Management Committee to sign off each episode (monitor screening).
2) It be based on process of education.
3) It be based on all phases of production – predation only being one part of it.

7. RESEARCH PROJECTS AND FUNDING

Version 5.0 - Hoole Wadl - Version 5.0

The Chairman referred to research done by ALPRU. Research needs will come from the structures of industries (the Mohair Growers' Congress listed research needs).

Mr. Gerhard Schutte suggested that the forum is pro-active and have a research strategy in place before service providers are requested to tender for research. Once you have determined what you need to research, a budget can be allocated to each project.

Mr. Leon de Beer referred to existing research structures of the red meat industry as well as the wool industry – research proposals to be channelled to those committees.

Decision: Each industry to provide research priorities to the Forum, where after they will determine where to source the funding. All projects to be driven by this Management Forum.

Responsibility: Forum.

8. FUTURE PROBLEM ANIMAL FORUM

8.1 Membership

8.2 Open or Closed

8.3 Constitution/Memo of Understanding

The policy document was discussed in depth to determine the relevance of the objectives and extensive changes were made. Mr. Andre Strydom was tasked to re-write the policy document and transfer into a constitution for the new collective body. It will be circulated to the working group and all parties are bound by it.

9. GENERAL MATTERS

9.1 Certificate of Adequate Enclosure (CAE)

It is the feeling of Mr. Wayman Kritzinger that the problem cannot be fought without a CAE form, a possible tool for problem animals. It is a principle of good neighbourliness.

Mr. Petrus de Wet undertakes to discuss the matter with Mr. Ernest Pringle and make mention of the matter when he meets with the Minister of Agriculture.

9.2 PAF declaration re gin traps

Cognisance.

9.3 RPO Press release – 9 May 2009

Cognisance.

9.4 Back ground information on meeting with the Minister July 2008

Cognisance.

9.5 Animals Rights Bill

Mr. Reinhardt Holtzhausen informed the meeting of the updating of the Animal Protection Right Act, implicating the banning of all kinds of hunting. It is his request that all parties object to the proposed changed Act. He undertakes to email it to Mr. Petrus de Wet.

10. MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE (DAGBESTUUR)

Name

Livestock- and Wildlife Working Group on Damage Causing Animals

Composition (Chairman of each industry, but to clarify within the industry)

1) *NWGA, Mr. Petrus de Wet*
2) *RPO, Mr. Arnold Brand*
3) *Mohair, Mr. Gerhard Grobler*
4) *Wildlife, Mr. Reinhardt Holtzhausen*

Schedule of meetings

The Management Committee to meet on a regular basis until such time that all issues on the table is resolved. Thereafter on a quarterly basis or an ad hoc basis as urgent matters arise.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

Payment of costs

Each industry pays the cost of their representative.

Secretariat

The NWGA will be the Secretariat for the Forum. Should the workload become too excessive, then it will be reconsidered.

Problem Animal Forum

The Forum will meet twice a year, but it will not be necessary to meet again this year because of the Management Committee dealing with the current issues on the table.

12 PRESS RELEASE at 16:00"

The Task Team on Damage Causing Animals convened on 28 July 2009 at DEAT's Head Office in Pretoria; Ms. Sonja Meintjes chaired it. No official minutes are available, but from personal notes kept by the author the following persons participated in discussions[813]: Ms. Sonja Meintjes (DEAT), Ms. Magdel Boshoff (DEAT), Mr. Thomas Mbedzi (DEAT), Dr. Bool Smuts (Landmark Foundation), Mr. Rob Harrison-White (Wildlife Damage Research and Management), Mr. Jaco van Deventer (CapeNature, Western Cape Province), Mr. Johannes Klopper (NWGA), Mr. Deon Cilliers (EWT) and Prof. HO de Waal (UFS/ALPRU).

Discussions were heated but focussed on improving a "*Draft Discussion Document on Norms and Standards for the Management of Damage-Causing Animals in South Africa*" under the specific headings of Research, Training, Definition of DCA and the Way Forward.

In the welcoming address, Ms. Sonja Meintjes referred to "*a document*". Dr. Bool Smuts immediately wanted to know what document she was referring to because he had received "*a copy from a member of the WG1*." The WG1 or Working Group 1 comprised senior officials from different provinces who were responsible for drafting documents in preparation for scheduled MinTech (Minister/Technical) and MinMec (Minister/Members of Executive Councils - provinces) meetings. With reference to a draft definition of DCA, which was provided by Mr. Tim Snow (EWT), Dr. Bool Smuts insisted that the DCA definition used in the draft document under discussion must be addressed accordingly.

On 31 August 2009, Mr. Petrus de Wet and Mrs. Bonita Francis of the NGWA, as well as Mr. Thys de Wet (a private specialist predator hunter) were served summons by the attorneys of Mr. Rob Harrison-White (and on behalf of Bool Smuts). The respondents were sued for alleged, "*defamation and losses incurred*"[814].

The drafting of Norms and Standards for the Management of Damage-Causing Animals in South Africa was pursued during 2009 under the auspices of DEAT. Some perceived the process of being biased towards conservation, but in submissions and discussions, ALPRU requested that the environmental and agricultural departments must both participate in the development of a coordinated system for managing damage-causing animals in South Africa. It was hoped that the sessions lead by DEAT to manage damage-causing animals (including the black-backed jackal and caracal) would provide procedures and methods to regulate activities. However, it became clear that these regulations did not provide for an effective monitoring of activities and especially a system of implementing and improving on current best practices. The development and implementation of such a system is the main objective of ALPRU's CCP.

[813] Editor's Note: Personal Notes kept by HO de Waal at the Task Team Meeting on 28 July 2009.

[814] Paragraph **4.4 Rob Harrison White/Thys de Wet** - minutes of the Management Committee of the Livestock & Wildlife Industry Working Group on DCA of 17 November 2009.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

Despite objections by the livestock and wildlife industries and ALPRU regarding the impracticality of some proposed norms and standards, a person in environmental affairs adopted a final unilateral approach and drafting a document which would have had dire consequences if implemented unchecked. It caused serious mistrust among role players and stakeholders. The "mishap" halted the process but provided a much-needed opportunity for the livestock and wildlife industries to engage as equal partners with DEAT and DAFF, through the Forum for Damage Causing Animals. Verbal assurances by officials that agriculture is on board sparked hope that DAFF would assume its role and responsibility for food security and play a meaningful role in the deliberations regarding predation management, thus addressing serious shortcomings in the process thus far.

Dr. Nico Avenant, Prof. HO de Waal and Mr. Walter van Niekerk presented scientific papers[815],[816],[817] on predation management at the Southern African Wildlife Management Symposium, 13-16 September 2009 at the Protea Hotel Black Mountain Conference Centre, Thaba Nchu, Free State Province.

Ms. Tina Joemat-Pettersson, Minister of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (DAFF) met on 28 September 2009 with a group of individuals regarding the impact of predation at the OR Tambo International Airport, Johannesburg. The group comprised Mr. Koos van der Ryst, Vice-President: RPO; Mr. Coligny Stegmann, Council Member: SAMGA; Prof. HO de Waal, ALPRU/Department of Animal, Wildlife and Grassland Sciences, UFS; Mr. Petrus de Wet, President: NWGA; and Dr. Gert Dry, President: WRSA. The impact of droughts, stock theft and predation as major risk factors was discussed with the Minister. The group emphasised the importance and urgent need for DAFF to become committed in the initiative to develop a system of predation management in South Africa.

The first meeting of the Management Committee of the Livestock & Wildlife Industry Working Group on DCA took place on Tuesday 17 November 2009 at the Wool Exchange, Grahamstown Road, North End, Port Elizabeth. Excerpts from the minutes[818] are quoted below:

> *"Attendance: Petrus de Wet (NWGA (Chairman), Coligny Stegmann (SA Mohair Growers' Association), Gerhard Grobler (SA Mohair Growers' Association), Lardus van Zyl (RPO (Large Stock Industry), Arnold Brand (RPO (Small Stock Industry), Arthur Rudman (Wild Life Industry - in place of Reinhardt Holtzhausen), Keith Ramsay (Nat. Dept. Agriculture, and Bonita Francis (Secretariat).*
>
> ***1. OPENING AND WELCOME***
>
> *Mr. Gerhard Grobler opened the meeting with prayer. Mr. Petrus de Wet welcomed all present.*

[815] Avenant, N.L., Steenkamp, E. & De Waal, H.O., 2009. Reviewing a case study on the effects of different management options to reduce predation on small livestock in the Karoo. Southern African Wildlife Management Association Symposium, 13-16 September 2009. Protea Hotel Black Mountain Conference Centre, Thaba Nchu, Free State Province, South Africa.

[816] De Waal, HO, Van Niekerk, Walter & Avenant, Nico, 2009. Recent advances in the quest for a co-ordinated predator management system in South Africa. Southern African Wildlife Management Association Symposium. 13-16 September 2009. Protea Hotel Black Mountain Conference Centre, Thaba Nchu, Free State Province, South Africa.

[817] Van Niekerk, H.N., Taljaard, P.R., Grové, B. & De Waal, H.O., 2009. The extent of predation on small livestock in the Free State Province of South Africa. Southern African Wildlife Management Association Symposium, 13-16 September 2009. Protea Black Mountain Conference Centre, Thaba Nchu, Free State Province, South Africa.

[818] Minutes - Management Committee of the Livestock & Wildlife Industry Working Group, 17 November 2009 in Port Elizabeth.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

2. APOLOGIES

None

3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

None

4. MATTERS FOR DISCUSSION

4.1 Constitution

The Constitution, which was amended and circularised, was accepted as a true reflection of the forum meeting and in a spirit of informal agreements over time. The following issues were however raised for consideration for change:

1) Name of the Forum (and abbreviation) needs to change

Some committee members felt that one needs to move away from the word "DCA" and focus more on "predators".

- *"Livestock Protection Forum" – the emphasis should be on the PROTECTION of your animals.*

Action: Arthur Rudman & Gerhard Grobler.

2) Paragraph 5.4 (page 3)

"The FDCA acknowledges that public opinion is generally opposed to DCA management. Although public opinion is often unfair and/or unjustified, it will at all times be taken seriously." The meeting felt that the opinion of the public is of the essence, but that the sentence be written in softer manner, taking into consideration that because of lack of knowledge or that the public is not well informed, their opinion can become unfair and unjustified.

Action: Petrus de Wet & Bonita Francis.

Decision: (1) The Committee expressed satisfaction with the Constitution on condition that the proposed changes be incorporated and circularised, and (2) The final Constitution to be approved at the next Forum meeting.

4.2 Progress with Norms and Standards

The Chairman referred to the Memorandum in the Agenda which refers to the current state of affairs with regards to the Norms and Standards, confirming that the process has now officially been stopped. The National Department will scrutinise the document and hopefully in January 2010, release an official document for commentary. It is however crucial that Mr. Ramsay keeps the forum informed of any changes.

Mr. Arthur Rudman appealed to Mr. Ramsay that the Department undertake road shows to get the consensus and cooperation from farmers/stakeholders with this process, otherwise the legislation will fail. The public can only believe what they hear and see.

Mr. Keith Ramsay briefly informed the meeting of his close working relationship with some Environmental officials because of them keeping to important due dates and referred to the very reason why this particular due dates were changed. Various meetings with the industry, environmental affairs and stake holders need to take place.

Mr. Arthur Rudman further pleaded with the Forum that the core problem is not being addressed and that the farmer himself needs to take responsibility for the killing of farm animals. "WE NEED TO DO SOMETHING". He is also of the opinion to promote guidelines rather than legislation and reaching consensus with the guidelines.

Mr. Petrus de Wet referred to countrywide DCA courses conducted by Mr. Neil Viljoen, which is funded by the various industries, creating a massive awareness of the problem and training farmers. It is however the Forum's responsibility to put legislation in place.

Version 5.0 - HO Ma Wadi Version 5.0

Mr. Ramsay suggested that the Forum draft the policy and guidelines, which will then be published in the Animal Protection Act, which will in turn get more level headed approach and positive influence from the NSPCA.

Mr. Lardus van Zyl is of the opinion that not enough research has been done and that the whole process be stopped, research be done and in 5 years' time, the policy document be written.

- *Research study on farm economics – what is the impact.*
- *Socio economic impact.*
- *Biodiversity with rural depopulation.*
- *Impact of DCA on meat – currently meat is imported, but should DCA be controlled, then this will no longer be necessary.*

Decision and Actions: (1) To instruct Antonie Geyer and Chrisna van Heerden, in cooperation with ALPRU and Herman van Schalkwyk to determine the impact of predation on total spectrum (socio economic costs; importation etc.) from study group data; (2) Official research project with formal budget – only then a scientific result can be obtained; (3) Each industry has a Code of Best Practice – to get these Codes to Keith Ramsay as a starting point. However, Coligny Stegmann is of the opinion that the Code does not contain sufficient information about DCA to compile a policy document; (4) On the suggestion of Mr. Keith Ramsay, the Livestock Welfare Coordinating Committee could be a route to follow; (5) Draft framework to be sent to Mr. Ramsay as soon as possible to get the document started, namely: (a) Problem statement and solutions to problem. To specifically pertain to predators and not damage causing animals. The problem statement should include that insufficient research is available; and (b) The policy document will just say how research should be done. Action: (i) Mr. Keith Ramsay to send a blank format for a policy document (headings etc); (ii) Dr. Amie Aucamp to draft the framework and seek inputs from other industries RPO (Gerhard Schutte), Wildlife (Re Reinhardt Holtzhausen), Mohair (Philip Vosloo) and if necessary, Mr. Ernest Pringle. Process will be work shopped electronically; (iii) Circulate internally to Forum members; (iv) Finalise the document at the next Forum meeting; and (6) Mr. Lardus van Zyl requested that the Forum establish its own letterhead and not use the one of the NWGA.

4.2.1 Email from Dr. Kas Hamman to the "Rapport"

The meeting discussed the letter by Dr. Kas Hamman, Cape Nature, which was contained in the Agenda. Some of the statements in the email were felt to be untrue.

Decision: The Chairman received the Forum's permission to ignore the email and not respond to it.

4.3 Ethical Committee

The Chairman conveyed a request from Mr. Smiley de Beer to establish an Ethical Committee. As per the previous suggestion of Mr. Keith Ramsay, the Livestock Welfare Coordinating Committee should be utilised to tackle issues of concern.

4.4 Rob Harrison White/NWGA/Thys de Wet

Mr. Petrus de Wet informed the meeting in detail that the NWGA, Mrs. Bonita Francis and Mr. Thys de Wet have been summoned by Mr. Rob Harrison White and Sagana Film Enterprises for defamation and losses incurred. They briefly discussed the summons document and the outcome of a meeting with a local attorney in Port Elizabeth, the previous day.

The following principles were accepted: (1) The defendant (Me. Francis) needs to be protected and the claim should be defended; (2) To possibly seek better deal from other

Version 5.0 – HC de Waal – Version 5.0

attorneys; and (3) The Forum jointly accepted liability for the matter and will all the industries defend the claim together.

Decision: (1) Affected personnel would be protected; (2) The NWGA to enter and defend the claim via Joubert, Galpin and Searle (JGS); (3) The matter to resolve under the auspices of the Forum and not the NWGA. Mrs. Patti Myburgh to contact insurance firm to consider the possibility of moving the claim to the Forum; (4) Each industry to investigate insurance claims in terms of defamation; (5) To seek the services of Annalize Crosby, legal consultant of Agri SA; (6) The RPO indicated that they need a well-structured letter, detailing the background and process of the summons. This would eliminate any speculation in the future; (7) No press release will be made to the Media at this stage. Should any enquiries be received regarding the summons, then the Forum will provide the necessary statement; and (8) No counter claim at this stage.

4.5 SA Game Ranchers – representative towards DEWA (re Bool Smuts and RHW)

The matter was not discussed due to the uncertainty about the content of the matter.

4.6 Request for research on Biological methods for predator control

The meeting discussed the request by Mr. Arthur Rudman for research on biological methods for predator control and the Chairman confirmed the merit for type of research.

Decision: (1) The meeting approved the request for research; (2) Research request to be channelled to Cape Wools SA and HO De Waal. To contact Mr. Arthur Rudman in this regard for necessary contracts and information. To also request the Mohair Industry for joint funding of the project; (3) Mr. Keith Ramsay will investigate sources of information on this topic on the website of the National Department of Agriculture; and (4) Letter to Agri East Cape to inform them of the process.

4.7 Cape Nature regulations

4.8 Issues in Western Cape which needs attention at national level

The meeting took cognisance of the Media Statement by Agri Western Cape, NWGA, RPO and Cape Nature re hunting proclamations.

Mr. Keith Ramsay gave background on the procedure for proclamations (there is a prescribed process), which could possibly be challenged.

Decision: (1) Request a copy of current hunting proclamations from provinces and scrutinise the content; and (2) Request provincial departments of DEAT to change provincial ordinances and the process to be followed. Should a department not have ordinances, they should provide a written reply. (Starting point is DEAT + ?Magdel Boshoff). Nature Conservation – Steve.

4.9 Farmers Prey

The meeting discussed the non-progress of the scheduled documentary due to the non-payment of approved budget by the SABC. The meeting is however confident that progress will be made as soon as money is paid over.

4.10 NWGA Website – link on DCA (pictures)

The meeting discussed the continued placement of DCA pictures on the NWGA website.

Decision: To also create links from NWGA website to sites of other industries. (Action – Elize Pretorius).

4.11 Press Release

The matter was discussed with Point 4.4.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

4.12 Progress with DAFF

The matter was discussed under previous points. Mr. Keith Ramsay said that he would make sure that the stakeholders are consulted and that the process is moved with DEAT.

5. MEETINGS

5.1 Next meeting of the Management Committee

Prior to the Forum meeting.

5.2 Next Forum meeting

To coincide with the Bloem Show in Bloemfontein. (End March/Beginning April 2010)

6. CLOSURE

Mr. Arnold Brand thanked Mr. Keith Ramsay for his attendance, saying that history was made in that the National Department could be present at the meeting.

Mr. Lardus van Zyl closed the meeting with prayer.

The meeting concluded at 12:25.'

It is often said that the actual losses and impact of predation are overstated[819]. Therefore, when an unintended opportunity arose, a study was initiated to quantify the impact of predation at the Glen Agricultural Institute (Glen AI). In its quest for more information on predation management, Strauss (2009) conducted the second study under the auspices of the CCP[820]; excerpts from the abstract of the study are quoted below:

"The impact of predation on reproduction and production performance of sheep flocks (Merino and Dorper) are reviewed and put into perspective for the period 1999 to 2007. Four categories of sheep losses were identified namely: predation, diseases, metabolic disorders or accidents and stock theft. Direct financial losses, veterinary and shearing cost, lick, labour and planted pasture cost were calculated for each of these categories of losses. The calculations were included in the review and served as basis for determining the extent to which financial losses ascribed to predation exceeded the financial losses due to diseases, metabolic disorders or accidents and stock theft.

Ewe productivity was negatively influenced by predation. The Merino and Dorper flocks decreased in numbers from 1 130 sheep to 552 sheep over a period of nine years. From 1999 until 2007, a total of 747 lambs were lost to predation before weaning and a total of 1 422 lambs were lost post weaning. The number of reproductive Merino and Dorper ewes that were available for mating declined from 506 ewes in 2003 to 316 ewes in 2007. Some of the ewes in the four Merino production system flocks, the shearing flock, and the Dorper flock could not raise one lamb in a six-year production cycle due to predation. Therefore, it became increasingly difficult to replace older ewes and maintain flock sizes for the respective flocks. The only exception was the Treatment SL-R&V flock, because they were better protected from predation during critical phases in the reproduction cycle.

The black-backed jackal specifically, had a big impact on the sheep flocks at the Glen AI (70% of the 730 post-weaning losses from 2003 until 2007). Losses ascribed to predation contributed to 72% of the total annual financial losses, diseases 2%, metabolic disorders or accidental mortalities 20% and stock theft only 6%. Therefore, the financial impact ascribed to predation at an average of R129 562/year overshadowed the losses due to diseases (average R4 337/year), metabolic disorders or accidents (average R35 299/year) and stock theft (average R9 843/year) by a considerable margin."

[819] Shelton, M., 2004. Predation and livestock production perspective and overview. *Sheep & Goat Res*. J. 19, 2-5.
[820] Strauss, Andries Jacobus, 2009. The impact of predation on a sheep enterprise in the Free State Province. M.Sc. Agric. dissertation. University of the Free State, Bloemfontein, South Africa.

Version 5.0 - HO de Wet - Version 5.0

Strauss (2009) then concluded:

> "*a large component of the genetic base of the two sheep breeds at the Glen AI has been lost for the future, due to the effect of predation.*"

The study by Strauss (2009) was only the second[821] reported case study in South Africa of sheep flocks at state institutions having been decimated by predation; it concurred with two comparable scenarios regarding predation on sheep in the USA. In Texas, producers have cited predation as one of the main reasons when they had abandoned sheep and goat production (Shelton, 2004). Furthermore, critics of predation control often refuted losses reported by individual producers or claims of the impact of predation on the livestock (sheep) industry, although evidence of such an impact could be verified in other ways. Two cases were reported where institutional research flocks in the USA have been terminated or greatly curtailed due to predation, namely an experimental flock maintained by the Texas Agricultural Experiment Station at McGregor, Texas[822] and another flock maintained by the University of California at Hopland Research and Extension Centre, California[823],[824].

The Minister of Environmental Affairs published a General Notice in the Government Gazette of 29 November 2010 (No. 33806); Notice 1084 of 2010 regarding "*Draft Norms and Standards for the Management of Damage-Causing animals in South Africa*."

2010

On 18 January 2010, Mr. Rob Harrison-White[825] wrote to the Working Group 1 and made important suggestions with respect to the "*Norms and Standards document*" which was published on 29 November 2010. Valuable information and references were provided. The 19-page letter was a continuation of input, which was made previously in meetings, specifically on 27 January 2009 and 11 March 2009. The letter dealt extensively with the following items: (1) definition of damage causing animal; (2) call and shoot hunting; (3) gin-traps and spring loaded devices (killer traps, etc.); (4) dog-hunting; (5) The holding of captured jackals, caracals and other wildlife for urine/faeces collection; and (6) the hunting of DCA's from an aircraft.

According to Mr. Rob Harrison-White "*There is little scientific or practical support for the continued use of most lethal predator management strategies listed in the latest Norms and Policy draft such as the dog hunting, gin-traps, coyote getters, poisons, and 'call and shoot' hunting*." The letter then continued:

> *"These predator management strategies have been a proven failure both to 'Food security' in South Africa despite their persistent and costly application for over 3 centuries. The failure of this approach is no more vividly portrayed than by the R1.1 billion losses to predation as claimed by de Waal/ALPRU and the livestock industry.*
>
> *Significant losses occur to sheep from causes other than predation, a fact supported by both International and South African research.*

[821] Postma, M., Aucamp, L.J.S. & Le Roux, P.C., 1993. Beskerming van skape op die HLOI se proefplaas te Potchefstroom. Proceedings of the Problem Animal Control Forum 4th – 5th May 1993. Golden Gate Highlands National Park, Orange Free State Province, South Africa. pp 53-57.

[822] Shelton, M., 1972. Predation losses in one flock of sheep and goats. National Wool Grower. Vol. 62. September 1972. (cited by Shelton, 2004).

[823] Timm, R.M. & Connolly, G.E., 2001. Sheep-killing coyotes a continuing dilemma for ranchers. California Agriculture 55, 26-31.

[824] Jaeger, M.M., 2004. Selective targeting of alpha coyotes to stop sheep depredation. *Sheep & Goat Res*. J. 19, 80-84.

[825] 18 January 2010 – letter of Mr. Rob Harrison-White to Working Group 1 - "Suggestions with respect to the 'Norms and Standards' document; attention: Fundisile Mketeni, Sonja Meintjes, Magdel Boshof, Nkhumeleni Mbedzi, Olga Kumalo.

Version 5.0 - HC de Waal - Version 5.0

The reported R1.1 billion predation loss to the livestock industry, a figure calculated through telephonic surveys and questionnaires, does not reflect the whole scenario around predation, even if the methodology is not questioned.

Current research in the Karoo (A. Haw), research done on sheep predation by Roberts D.H 1986 in KZN, and even research on sheep mortalities from predation in Australia (Ian Rowley CSIRO Wildl.Res.1970) show sheep health and the lack of sheep husbandry to be a major factor leading to predation and livestock mortalities.

Roberts found that dogs accounted for up to 83% of predations.

The content of the Norms and Standards Document should therefore encourage farmers to ***revisit alternative strategies for protection and management of their livestock and*** *move from the focus on* ***"predator reduction and eradication"*** *to* ***'stock protection and husbandry'*** *as a primary objective to effect 'Food Security' and the protection of Biodiversity.*

DEAT has to lead the way in this regard with policies based on sound scientific and practical data.

In truth Predators are remarkably good at controlling their own numbers without any interference.

Although predation by jackals and caracal are an indisputable factor in livestock production, lack of ***animal husbandry and stock protection*** *(not the lack of predator management strategies) are seen as the most threatening factors to: (1) predator population control; (2) predatory losses to livestock "food security"; (3) South Africa Biodiversity; (4) job creation. A focus shift away from attempted predator management towards stock management through proven cost effective and ecologically friendly livestock management alternatives such as animal husbandry and shepherding would provide mass job opportunities which would be unparalleled by most industries; and (5) Tourism*."

Since the launch of the CCP in 2004, ALPRU conducted a literature study, specifically aimed at collating international best practices in predation management. In January 2010, the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS), Wildlife Services (WS) released its Strategic Plan (2010-2014); of particular importance was its Management Philosophy:

"In the United States, wildlife is a public resource held in trust and managed by State and Federal agencies. Government agencies, including WS, are required by law and regulation to conserve and manage wildlife resources while being responsive to the public desires, views, and attitudes. In so doing, agencies must respond to requests for resolution of damage and other problems caused by wildlife.

Wildlife may cause significant damage to agricultural crops and livestock, forests, pastures, property and infrastructure in urban and rural areas, and threatened and endangered species and their habitats. Wildlife also can threaten human health and safety through animal-borne diseases and hazards to aircraft. Prevention and management of wildlife conflicts is an essential and responsible part of wildlife management. Before wildlife damage management programs are undertaken, careful assessments will be made of the problem and all options for resolving or mitigating the problem will be considered. Actions considered and employed will be scientifically based, biologically sound, environmentally safe, and socially responsible."

Acceleration of preparatory groundwork for a visit abroad to gain first-hand insight on predation management culminated in a meeting between Dr. Nico Avenant and Prof. HO de Waal and two USA colleagues at the UFS in Bloemfontein on 13 April 2010. Dr. Dale Nolte and Mr. David

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

Bergman were attending the *7th International Rodent Management Congress* at the UFS; after the meeting, an e-mail[826] was distributed to key role players:

"Dear Dale and David (and Michael)

Thank you for meeting with me yesterday (13 April 2010) at the UFS and the opportunity to discuss some challenges relating to the impact of predation in South Africa. The livestock and wildlife industries are negatively impacted by predation, specifically by the black-backed jackal Canis mesomelas and caracal Caracal caracal.

During our discussions additional information was provided to broaden the background and highlight specific needs on our side. Instead of trying to reinvent the wheel, it is obvious that we can gain much from sharing in your longstanding experience as well as recent advances in predation management.

We have also discussed the broad objectives for a short visit to the US by a small dedicated group of individuals. We require guidance to be introduced in the USA to key operators and activities in the context of predation management.

Our objectives can be summarised as an urgent need to gain insight and knowledge regarding the following:

** the organisation (organizational chart) and activities of the federal agency or agencies responsible for predator management.*

** the organisation (organizational chart) and activities of some of the state agencies responsible for predator management (focus on a few selected states only).*

** the development and implementation of policies (norms and standards/regulations) regarding predator management, with a specific focus on the way different federal and state agencies co-operate and share responsibilities and information.*

** how, when and at what level is interaction and participation arranged with farmers/ranchers (affected groups) during policy development?*

** by whom, when and how are activities co-ordinated and monitored (federal and/or state)?*

** how and where is institutional memory created (data/information collated), maintained and incorporated into "best practices" for broader implementation?*

** how are the specialists (previously known as trappers) organised and operating?*

** are these specialists only federal/state officials or is private enterprise also allowed and encouraged?*

** how and if so to what extent does extension play a role at the operational level?*

** relevant training programmes for staff and clients (farmers/ranchers).*

** research facilities and capacity (federal and/or state); specifically the prioritisation and resource allocation.*

** how are funds obtained and allocated for different activities and is there provision to allow for the merging of public and private funding?*

In addition to a scientist (ALPRU/UFS), the small group of four individuals will provisionally include two officials from the Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (DAFF) and the Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA) and a farmer (president of a livestock producers' organisation). Names and positions must still be verified before the specific information is disclosed. This process can be concluded towards the end of next week (23 April 2010).

It seems the first window of opportunity for a visit should be during the period from 17 to 28 May 2010 (excluding travelling time from and to SA, which will be conducted during the two weekends).

If it is not possible to arrange matters in time, we must proceed towards the next option at the end of July (after the FIFA football WC in SA has ended by mid-July).

[826] E-mail by HO de Waal on 14 April 2010 to Dr. Dale Nolte, Mr. David Bergman & Mr. Michael Bodenchuk, and copied to Mr. Petrus de Wet, Mrs. Magdel Boshoff, Mr. Keith Ramsay and Dr. Nico Avenant.

Version 5.0 - Hoade Waal - Version 5.0

Please see this as the first round of drafting the planning. We can adjust and adapt the final itinerary according to your discretion and circumstances. However, we will soon need firm dates and letters of invitation to apply in time for visas (in person at the USA Embassy in Pretoria).

Regards HO

CC Petrus, Keith and Magdel for your information – will keep you in the loop."

Three days later on 16 April 2010 Dr. Nico Avenant and Prof. HO de Waal held a second meeting with Dr. Dale Nolte, Assistant Coordinator for International Programs, National Wildlife Disease Program, USAD/APHIS/Wildlife Services, Fort Collins, Colorado and Mr. David Bergman, Wildlife Services State Director, Phoenix, Arizona to start planning the detail and an itinerary of the proposed visit.

The second meeting of the Management Committee of the Livestock & Wildlife Industry Working Group on DCA was held on Tuesday 20 April 2010 at the Haldon Estate, Kwaggafontein near Bloemfontein. Excerpts from the minutes[827] are quoted below:

"*Attendance: Petrus de Wet (NWGA (Chairman), Leon de Beer (NWGA General Manager), Coligny Stegmann (SA Mohair Growers' Association), Gerhard Grobler (SA Mohair Growers' Association), Lardus van Zyl (RPO, Large Stock Industry), Arnold Brand (RPO, Small Stock Industry), Reinhardt Holtzhausen (Wildlife Ranching SA), Keith Ramsay (Nat. Dept. Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (DAFF), HO de Waal (ALPRU) and Bonita Francis (Secretariat).*

1. OPENING AND WELCOME

Mr. Gerhard Grobler opened the meeting with prayer. Mr. Petrus de Wet welcomed all present.

2. APOLOGIES

Gerhard Schutte, RPO, Jacques Malan, Wildlife Ranching SA.

3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the previous meeting, which were held on 17 November 2009 at the Wool Exchange, Port Elizabeth was accepted as a true reflection of the meeting on the proposal of Mr. Gerhard Grobler and seconded by Mr. Lardus van Zyl.

4. Matters arising from the Minutes

"4.2 Progress with Norms and Standards

The Decision and Action stipulates that Mr. Keith Ramsay is to send a blank format for policy document where after Dr. Amie Aucamp will draft the framework and seek inputs from industries.....'

Mr. Keith Ramsay undertook to provide two framework documents – guidelines for elephants as well as a wildlife ranching policy that can be used for the drafting of the framework.

5. MATTERS FOR DISCUSSION

5.1 Constitution

Letterhead and Logo

The above matters were discussed together.

[827] Minutes - Management Committee of the Livestock & Wildlife Industry Working Group on DCA, 20 April 2010, Bloemfontein.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal Version 5.0

The Committee once again discussed the name for the Forum and considered the proposed logo and names as put forward by a designing company. The following names were part of the sifting process: (1) Wild life and Stock Predation Group; (2) Predator Forum; (3) Should move away from "damage causing animals" and rather concentrate on "stock predation management". The Committee was in agreement with this direction; and (4) The purpose of this Forum is to investigate ways to reduce the effect of predation, by utilising different management practices by reducing risk.

Decision with regards to Letterhead and Logo: (1) The Committee was in agreement that the name changes to "PMF" which stands for "Predation Management Forum"; and (2) Design company to go back to the drawing board and design a logo comprising a paw print with shepherd's crook. (Blend a lynx and caracal spoor in an universal/abstract manner).

Discussion with regards to Constitution

Paragraph 5.4 (page 3)

The following wording to be considered by the Committee: "The FDCA will at all times be sensitive to public opinion on issues related to DCA management. Lack of sound and relevant information may on occasion lead to public opinion being unfair and/or unjustified. The FDCA will however at all times respond in an appropriate manner with due respect for the public in this regard."

After much debate and deliberation, the following clause was accepted by the Committee: "The PMF recognises the need to inform the public on the effect of predation on livestock and wildlife industries and the management thereof."

Paragraph 5.7 (page 4)

The meeting discussed the usage of certain words in the paragraph which could create antagonism and replaced it with more acceptable terminology. The following was accepted by the Management Committee (5.7.1 – 5.7.4 to be removed from the constitution and replaced with single sentence: "The PMF endorses an approach which is scientifically based, biologically sound, environmentally safe and socially responsible".

Decision with regards to Constitution: (1) On the proposal of Mr. Coligny Stegmann and seconded by Mr. Lardus van Zyl, the Constitution was accepted with the following changes/additions: (a) new name of the Forum, (b) Replace all "DCA" words with "predation", and (c) Paragraphs 5.4 and 5.7 was accepted as proposed above; and (2) The revised Constitution will be presented to the Forum meeting the following day.

6. RESEARCH COMMITTEE AND FUNDING

The Chairman briefly gave background about the "Concept framework for a cooperative Stock Predation Research Programme in South Africa", under the leadership of Prof. Graham Kerley, Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University. The Management Committee was also involved in a Teleconference where the process and procedure was explained.

Mr. Leon de Beer explained the extent of the document and gave more detailed facts and information to the meeting. The programme will start with a scientific assessment, which will bring about the identification of new scientific research needs. Training and predator control management programmes will continue with awareness campaigns being one of the most important aspects of the concept. The establishment of experimental farms remains important and the statistics of the programme which Niel Viljoen is driving, must be accredited. Each province will submit their own business and action plans.

The following remarks were noted:

1) Responsibility of the Programme

Mr. Petrus de Wet said that taking into account that the Forum only meets once a year, the meeting should consider that the Steering Committee, who meets more

Version 5.0 - Hoofweg Version 5.0

frequently, is the grouping who will be responsible for the programme. He feels that it is necessary that final decision making resides with this grouping because they are able to distinguish between priorities for research projects. They should have the authority for checks and balances.

Mr. Arnold Brand is of the opinion that the Steering Committee in not a scientific committee and should the planning and priority committees be in place, then the concept is right.

Mr. Coligny Stegmann agrees with Mr. Petrus de Wet that the funding and control of the programme should reside with PMF. PMF will contract services to the NWGA/RPO/SAMGA/Wildlife Ranchers SA. Mr. Keith Ramsay from NDA felt comfortable with the proposed system of funding. PMF will make sure that research is client driven and not industry driven.

2) Composition of Committee

Mr. Lardus van Zyl is of the opinion that the "green grouping" form part of this committee and that they are included in the planning process in looking for solutions for the problem. It will give more credibility to the system. The final say with regards to funding still resides with the PMF.

Prof. HO De Waal agrees with the concept of the programme but is it important to realise that it is actually the Government's responsibility to monitor and coordinate research. They also have the financial power to achieve this role. It is important that industries get actively involved with efforts to combat the problem, but Government should be the face for predation management. They should be the residing and neutral agent where all these principles come together.

Mr. Leon de Beer explained that many government departments form part of the ACE Advisory Board (Centre for African Conservation Ecology), namely ARC, Dept. Agric. and Land Affairs (EC), Environment and Tourism (EC) etc., who participate in the decisions of the programme.

Mr. Keith Ramsay remarked that DAFF uses Science and Technology (CSIR) as the vehicle for research (they contract research to institutions). The CSIR office in PE could possibly be approached to partner in this programme.

To take into account the work done by ALPRU and volume of information/results within the project.

Mr. Lardus van Zyl suggested that training get scrapped from the programme because it is currently being done by Niel Viljoen. Thys de Wet as well as Peter Schneekluth is also candidates for training programmes.

Decision: (1) The Committee accepted the principles of the Concept Framework; (2) The PMF will form the research basis and at the annual meeting of the Forum, an hour will be set aside to deal with research matters. The grouping of DAFF and DEA are allowed to nominate 1 "green" representative to attend the research part of the meeting. This representative must be registered as a Natural Scientist (according to the Act.); (3) Research needs will then be passed onto the Scientific Management Committee. This body should have the independence of the State and contract/tender identified research projects to research institutions. Consideration must be given to appoint a chairperson from Government; (4) However, the principle of the responsibility of government as chairman must be resolved within the Scientific Committee; Payment of research projects will be drawn from Industry funds (placement of Trust to be finalised within Scientific Committee). Funds from the Departments of Agriculture and Environmental Affairs will be calculated on a rand-to-rand basis and held within their own Trusts; (5) The Steering Committee will consider research proposals in September for the commencement of projects in January 2011; and (6) The NWGA to get involved with training programmes in RPO production areas such as Limpopo and North West (communal areas) where

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

service delivery from NWGA is non-existent. (A) LARDUS TO DISCUSS WITH RPO MANGEMENT; and (B) TO INVOLVE THE NWGA WITH THESE DISCUSSIONS.

6. FUNDING OF PMF

The meeting discussed ways to fund the activities of PMF. Some suggested that it be funded on a hoc basis, but Mr. Coligny Stegmann said that one should rather strive to build a fund. Each industry should make provision in their annual budgets for PMF activities (visit to Ministers, advertisements to inform the public about the problem, costs associated with meetings, printing costs etc.). By doing this, PMF will portray the face of the Forum (industries).

Decision: (1) Each industry will be invoiced by the NWGA for R5 000 for the building of a PMF fund; and (2) Articles in publications to show what PMF is planning to achieve.

7. PROGRESS REPORT: NORMS AND STANDARDS

To discuss the following day at the Forum meeting.

8. DAFF SUBMISSION TO DEA

Mr. Keith Ramsay informed the Committee about a letter from the Minister of DAFF to the Minister of Environmental Affairs (DEA) re the industry concerns on the draft Norms and Standards for the management of DCA in SA. The letter stipulates that jackal and caracal pose a major threat to the livestock and wildlife industries in SA – so much so that if left unchecked, it could lead to the collapse of the small stock industry in SA within the next five years, which have far reaching implications on food security. The letter recommends that the current draft N&S process be put on hold until more on-farm scientific research is carried out.

Decision: Process to be driven to get letter to the Minister of DEA as soon as possible.

9. STRATEGIC PLAN US WILDLIFE SERVICES

Prof. HO De Waal gave a brief overview of a proposed study tour to America – Wildlife Service Directorate (function and federal mandate of the State) from 17 – 28 May 2010. This Directorate will advise on their current strategic plan; how do they implement policy; how do they disseminate information; how does the funding systems operate; government driven systems etc. The plan is to take a small delegation – invitation was extended to Keith Ramsay, DAFF, Magdel Boshoff, DEWA, himself as a scientist and somebody from this grouping. He sees it as an investment for South Africa and is excited about the prospects. The cost is approximately R30 000 per person.

Decision: (1) Mr. Keith Ramsay indicated that he cannot give assurance for funding from DAFF. Possibly payment for his own cost, but he will attempt for funding for an additional delegate (Producer); and (2) The names of Mr. Coligny Stegmann and Petrus de Wet as second were proposed. Should Mr. Keith Ramsay secure funding, the above persons could be considered.

10. COURT CASE: ROB HARRISON WHITE

Mr. Leon de Beer reported about the progress. Mr. Thys de Wet eventually received his summons and defence and plea were submitted.

A legal opinion is now being obtained and will cost between R30 000 and R50 000. Securities are also requested from RHW.

The Chairman felt that it is time to release a media report stipulating that all four industries are jointly responsible for the court case and prepared to follow suit. To also mention that we are covered by insurance. The first prize is to get out of the law suit and not go to court.

Decision: (1) The committee decided that no press release will be issued now. Instead the contact detail of the lawyer will be provide to LBWB so that the lawyer can speak to

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

them on behalf of the client; and (2) The industries once again confirmed their commitment to the court case.

11. LETTERHEAD AND LOGO

Discussed.

12. OTHER MATTERS

12.1 Report back: M.Sc. Agric. of Walter van Niekerk

Mr. HO De Waal reported briefly about the Biological control of .... The thesis is near completion where after he will provide the industries with a copy for official publication.

12.2 Role and responsibility of Dept. Agriculture/Dept. of Environmental Affairs regarding predator management

Matter to be discussed at the Forum meeting the following day.

12.3 Role and responsibility of District Municipalities regarding predator management

Mr. Coligny Stegmann enquires about the role and responsibility of Municipalities. Until two years ago, money was received from municipalities but now the system has stopped and he suggests that we attempt to tap into the new legislation of municipalities and try and get money for training, research etc. The Laingsburg Municipality recently received money for this purpose.

Public Awareness:

Mr. HO De Waal said that continuous and persistent press releases and media associated activities will play a major factor in changing the systems of people and associations.

Mr. Lardus van Zyl offered to assist by way of the RPO webpage and monthly newsletter. To also utilise the NWGA Wool Farmer, talk show discussions, explanatory summaries to industries etc.

Mr. Gerhard Grobler expresses the absolute necessity to look at methods to positively raise and influence public awareness about the problem: (a) Shock photographs of what animals look like after being attacked by predators; (b) To place pressure on government to stop legislation which could damage the small stock industry; (c) Utilise billboards to get message across; (d) Face Book and Twitter; and (e) Extension of Posters at agricultural shows/exhibitions etc.

Decision: Mr. Gerhard Grobler to discuss the matter with the Media company of Mohair SA and come up with a proposal, which will be workshopped between the Committee members."

The Predation Management Forum (PMF) met on Wednesday 21 April 2010 in the Board Room of Free State Agriculture, Bloemfontein. Excerpts from the minutes[828] are quoted below:

*"Present: **NWGA** - Petrus de Wet (Chairperson), Leon de Beer (General Manager), Jannie Roets (Eastern Cape), Tommie van der Walt (Northern Cape), Niel Viljoen (co-opted), Douglas Calldo (Western Cape), Gert Loggenberg (Free State), Hendrik Botha (KwaZulu-Natal), **SA Mohair Growers' Assoc.** - Gerhard Grobler, Coligny Stegmann, **RPO** - Lardus van Zyl (Large Stock Industry), Arnold Brand (Small Stock Industry), Gerhard Schutte (General Manager), Nic Zaayman (Free State), **Wildlife Ranching SA** - Reinhardt Holtzhausen (General Manager), **ALPRU** - HO de Waal, **Dept. Agriculture** - Keith Ramsay (National), **Environmental Affairs** - Magdel Boshoff (National), Thomas Mbedzi (National), Sam Makhubele (Limpopo Province), T. Khambani (Limpopo Province), Jaco van Deventer (Cape Nature), Wessel Jacobs (Northern Cape), Tim de Jongh (Eastern Cape), Lourens Goosen (Free State), Andy Blackmore (KwaZulu-Natal), **Scientist** - Thys de Wet and **Secretariat** - Bonita Francis.*

[828] Minutes – meeting of the Predation Management Forum, 21 April 2010, Bloemfontein.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

1. OPENING AND WELCOME

Mr. Jannie Roets opened the meeting with prayer. The Chairman welcomed everyone by name.

2. APOLOGIES

Hannes Blom – Free State Environmental Affairs, Robert Wilke – Free State Environmental Affairs, Jacques Malan – Wildlife Ranching SA, Thys Delport – NWGA Western Cape and Johannes Klopper – NWGA Mpumalanga.

3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Minutes of the previous Problem Animal Forum Workshop, which was held on 2 July 2009 in Port Elizabeth, was approved on the proposal of Prof. HO de Waal and seconded by Mr. Gerhard Grobler.

4. RESEARCH

4.1 Concept framework for a Cooperative Stock Predation Research Programme in South Africa

The following decisions were taken at the Steering Committee meeting for ratification at this Forum: (1) This grouping is no longer the "Livestock and Wildlife Industry Working Group on DCA (L&WIWGDCA), but have accepted the name "Predation Management Forum (PMF)." The proposal is that all research submissions will be presented to this Forum, who meets annually. This meeting will allow a 1-hour discussion for research proposals and the departments of DAFF & DEA are able to nominate 1 representative from the "green grouping" to be part of this meeting. An extremely important criteria for participation is that the "green representative" is registered as a professional natural scientist under the Act; (2) These research needs will then be passed onto the Scientific Management Committee. Consideration should be given by this Committee to appoint a chairperson employed by Government. The Head of Grootfontein ADI was mentioned as a possibility; (3) Technically, the timing of the meeting of the PMF is not ideal, but the Committee will feel its way into this and should it be necessary, the Steering Committee will deal with initial research requests; (4) Funding of research projects (a) Industries have research trusts from where monies will be invoiced for payment of research contracts; (b) Had discussions with departments of DAFF and DEA with the request that they allocate funding on a rand-to-rand basis with Industries. Ms. Magdel Boshoff requires the necessary wording/motivation from the NWGA to structure her request to the DEA to be in line with the advantage for communities; (c) Mr. Gerhard Schutte suggested that PMF create a centralised website where interested researchers can apply to do the research. A scientific database be set up on the website. The responsibility of the action to be sorted between the Industries; (5) Research needs (a) Mr. Gerhard Schutte wants this Forum to be more pro-active and take the initiative to identify research needs to the Scientific Management Committee; (b) Each industry has its own research committee and those projects will flow to this committee; (c) The first phase of the framework is to do the scientific assessments, which will then clearly identify research needs; (5) Mr. Andy Blackmore from the KZN Dept. Environmental Affairs requires that a definite terms of reference be drawn up for scientists to keep them on track.

Decision: On the proposal of Mr. Coligny Stegmann and seconded by Mr. Tommie van der Walt, the Forum accepted the principles of the Concept Framework.

4.1.1.1 The effectiveness of lethal and non-lethal control measures for caracal in the Winterberg region of the Eastern Cape (Dr. Dan Parker, Rhodes University)

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

The Forum briefly discussed the content of the project and accepted that it be passed on to the Scientific Management Committee.

4.1.1.2 <u>Sheperd Project – seek funding for prototype collar with electronic unit (Louw Steffens)</u>

Mr. Petrus de Wet is of the opinion that this project belongs in the free market, because it is not this Forum's responsibility to develop products.

Prof. HO De Waal however feels that the project has merit, however it is still in the beginning stages and only when the product is in a state of evaluation it could be considered for funding.

Mr. Keith Ramsay suggested that Science and Technology and the DTI be approached with this concept – they have funding mechanisms and the PMF could possibly facilitate.

<u>Decision:</u> The project proposal was not accepted. Letter to be sent to Mr. Steffens explaining that this is a private enterprise and should he need capital for the development of the product, he can approach the DTI and possible other avenues.

4.1.1.3 <u>Behavioural and hunting patterns of jackal as well as losses incurred on farms adjacent to parks boards and holiday/vacant farms (request from SJB Schoeman, Willowmore)</u>

This project is part of the national programme. The Forum approved the proposal and accepted that it be passed onto the Scientific Management Committee (on the proposal of Mr. Coligny Stegmann and seconded by Mr. Douglas Calldo).

4.1.1.4 <u>Niel Viljoen training courses on DCA</u>

Mr. Niel Viljoen presented a detail summary of courses conducted on a national basis for 2009/2010. Various statistics from farmer surveys were presented as well as control methods, number of farmers and labourers trained as well as provincial stock losses experienced.

The objective of training included: (1) Transfer of knowledge to persons at ground level (farmers and labourers); (2) Creating awareness about the behavioural patterns of animals; and (3) Application of correct control methods.

Mr. Douglas Calldo said that the extent of training figures gathered by Mr. Neil Viljoen could actually be tripled, because many farmers have become so despondent that figures are not recorded. He is of the opinion that stock losses due to predators be declared as a national disaster.

Mr. Gerhard Grobler relayed some statistics in his area, which portrays the severity of the problem. He has used 11 control methods and resorted to kraaling the animals, with little success.

Mr. Wessel Jacobs, Northern Cape Nature Reserve requested that the data collection form from Niel, be standardised and distributed on a national level. This would assist with the data retrieval from farmers.

<u>Decision</u>: Proposal from the Forum that Mr. Niel Viljoen transfer own information and data into a scientific project and submit to the Scientific Management Committee.

4.1.2 <u>Communication Strategy</u>

4.1.2.1 Public awareness through the media

A strategy needs to be developed. Proposals to be brought to the table at the next Steering Committee meeting. Any suggestions to be given to the Secretariat.

To also follow up the matter with Mr. David Crichton on the "Farmers Prey" film production which he intended to do. Mr. De Wet undertook to follow up on this matter.

5. GENERAL MATTERS

5.1 Constitution

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

Paragraph 5.4 (page 3)

The following wording to be considered by the Committee: "The FDCA will at all times be sensitive to public opinion on issues related to DCA management. Lack of sound and relevant information may on occasion lead to public opinion being unfair and/or unjustified. The FDCA will however at all times respond in an appropriate manner with due respect for the public in this regard."

After much debate and deliberation, the following clause was accepted by the Committee: "The PMF recognises the need to inform the public on the effect of predation on livestock and wildlife industries and the management thereof.

Much debate and deliberations followed over the above point. Mr. Andy Blackmore from the KZN Dept. Environmental Affairs proposed that the wording be changed to the following: "The Forum recognises that predators play an important role in the ecology and wellbeing of the environment and as such this role will not be unduly compromised by predation management. A balanced and risk adverse approach will therefore be applied in decision making and promoting predator management."

However, many forum members from the Producer grouping expressed scepticism with the wording and would prefer to add "Production and Farming" environment into the clause.

Decision: On the proposal of Mr. Coligny Stegmann and seconded by Mr. Lardus van Zyl, the matter will be referred to the Steering Committee for finalisation.

5.2 Court Case: Rob Harrison White

Mr. Leon de Beer reported briefly on the progress of the case.

On the request of Ms. Magdel Boshoff, Mr. Petrus de Wet sketched the background to the court case.

Mr. Lardus van Zyl suggested that a fund be generated for similar incidents.

Mr. Arnold Brand said that the Forum cannot operate without the goodwill of all the role players. We have to develop a strategy to include the role of the "green groupings and conservation groups". We cannot escape it.

Mr. Petrus de Wet replied that a decision was taken last year that a platform will not be created for these individuals where they can be entertained. That was the undertaking by all the industries at the previous meeting.

Decision: Mr. Gerhard Schutte to investigate the possibility of a creating a fund for similar incidents.

5.3 Proposed Logo for Forum

The proposed logo with the Shepard's Crook and universal footprints of lynx and jackal was presented and accepted by the Forum.

5.4 RPO – Attempt to declare DCA as a disaster under current legislation

Mr. Petrus de Wet said that the matter was taken up with Agri SA to declare DCA under the same lines as Grasshoppers, Finches etc. Awaiting their comment.

Mr. Keith Ramsay undertook to take the matter up with Departments of Disaster Management and Legal Services and to make recommendations to the Steering Committee. He recalls Disaster Management Act 43 dealing with compensation. To use the following phrase to motivate the issue, namely: "Declare predation as national disaster, threatening the export of fibres, socio economics, labour and food security in South Africa."

5.5 Farmers' Prey

The matter was discussed under the "Public awareness through the media" point.

Version 5.0 - Pro de Waal - Version 5.0

5.6 Report back: M.Sc. Agric of Walter van Niekerk

Prof. HO de Waal reported on the extrapolation figures of goats and sheep in the commercial sector and losses calculated in 2006/2007.

6. INVOLVEMENT OF OTHER STAKEHOLDERS

6.1 Department of Agriculture

6.1.1 Progress: Norms and Standards

There are many similarities in the norms and standards of both departments and will the long-term approach focus on threatening the food security in South Africa.

6.1.2 The role and responsibility of Department for the current disastrous state of affairs with DCA

Considering the amount of money lost to Government on VAT alone, the Department of Agriculture need to consider an annual departmental budget for this problem. Point raised by Mr. Lardus van Zyl.

Mr. Keith Ramsay said that the function of DAFF is much in line with DEA in that legislation needs to be administrated. Research these days is aimed at solving problems.

6.1.3 Appointment with the Minister of Agriculture

Mr. Petrus de Wet is planning to request another meeting with the Minister, highlighting the pressure from farmers over the biggest threat to the livestock and wildlife industries, namely predators. The PMF is looking after the interests of its members and an urgent meeting needs to be finalised.

6.2 Department of Environmental Affairs

6.2.1 Progress: Norms and Standards

Ms. Magdel Boshoff presented the draft Norms and Standards for the management of damage causing animals in South Africa, giving some feedback on the process. She sketched where the process started in April 2006 and the groupings who were involved with the process. She then explained what the purpose of the DCA N&S are, namely: (1) Provide a uniform national approach to the management of DCA's; (2) Provide minimum standards to: (a) Assist issuing authorities to develop legislation or policies; (b) Provide for the lawful use of methods and equipment; and (c) Assist any person/group of persons who manages DCA's or provide equipment for the management of DCA's; (2) Applies to all DCA's in SA; and (3) No species are specifically classified as DCA's.

Under the draft provisions, the following restricted methods (requiring permits) are proposed: (1) Trap cages; (2) Poison collars; (3) Soft traps (jaws not serrated; jaws padded; space of at least 5mm between closed jaws; placement of traps). A transition period is allowed for soft traps for a period of 3 years after promulgation of the N&S. After that period, research needs to be done on effective alternative methods. Otherwise, prohibition of any type of gin traps; and (4) Use of dogs.

The Department further proposed criteria for compensation, namely: (a) Cost to implement compensation strategy; (b) Species involved and origin; (c) Negligence on part of landowner or State; and (d) Management options already implemented.

The document contains draft provisions and submitted in the approval process to publish for comment, not for implementation. Ms Boshoff undertakes to send the document to the Secretariat for circulation to members.

Mr. Petrus de Wet expressed concern over the following: (1) The process was flawed right from the beginning – the industries were not involved in the initial negotiations and meetings. Working Group 1 is a government structure and industry was not represented. Votes were taken at an open forum. He questioned why the process cannot be stopped. Magdel Boshoff replied that officials handed over the process and some have resigned. Government will not support the process if it is stopped; (2) The contentious issue is gin traps. The draft proposes that after 3 years, gin traps will no longer be used. Government

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 4.0

is taking a tool, which is sometimes the only successful tool in certain areas, out of the hands of producers to combat this problem. At previous meetings where the Task team, Industry and Agriculture was present, a compromise was reached with regards to Gin traps, now research needs to be done only after three years. Magdel Boshoff replied that the industry will have the opportunity to comment on the draft, therefore they should propose that it be changed. The Department assess every single comment they receive; (3) Government undertakes to train persons in DCA management (purpose of DCA N&S). They do not have the capacity, therefore how can they institute legislation?? Magdel Boshoff replied that at the stage of drafting the N&S, they did not have any information on available training. She will however speak to Niel Viljoen and Thys De Wet on training courses. She confirmed that the Department do not have the capacity on provincial level; (4) Compensation. This criteria is completely impractical due to the fact that origin of species and negligence is not something that can easily be proven. One can also not put a percentage on damages being experienced.

Mr. Lardus van Zyl gets the feeling that one needs to get used to the draconian laws which are enforced upon farmers. Once research has proven that there is no alternative for the use of gin traps, then the tool becomes unlawful. He feels that the Department is making it as difficult as possible for farmers to provide their product and feed South Africa. The success of the law will depend on: (a) Policing of stock owners; and (b) Acceptability by those people who the law will be enforced upon.

Should the above not be adhered to, the objectives of the legislation would be misplaced.

Mr. Coligny Stegmann foresees that most farmers will turn into criminals if this legislation is accepted. Farmers will resort to unlawful ways of combating the problem.

Prof. HO De Waal pleaded with the Department to delay the process until common agreement has been reached – if not, serious implications will be evident.

Ms. Magdel Boshoff relayed her final comment in that the Department needs to liaise with all the role players including the Industry, the NSPCS, the client and somewhere in the middle need to find a midway, which they cannot ignore. She requests that the industry acknowledge where they come from and that everyone will have the opportunity to comment on the document.

Decision: (1) Dept. of Environmental Affairs need to take note of the request of this Forum, namely, that they are not happy with the process and as requested in June 2009, that the current draft N&S be put on hold until more on-farm scientific research is carried out; (2) A letter by the Minister of Agriculture addressed to the Minister of Environmental Affairs is in final process of implementation. In this letter, the Minister is informed of the far reaching implications of predators on food security with a request that the process be put on hold until more research is done – including a study tour to the US to review their system of predator management in particular. THE URGENCY OF GETTING THIS LETTER TO THE MINISTER WAS CONFIRMED; (3) Mr. Arnold Brand informed the meeting of the existence of a "Compliance Committee" within the RPO which addresses the compliances of Acts. Should this draft N&S be accepted, then it is basically violating the constitutional rights of livestock owners. He will seek legal opinion on this matter; and (4) Ms. Magdel Boshoff to keep the Forum informed about the process (document will only be published for public comment within the next 4 months).

6.2.2 The role and responsibility of Department for the current disastrous state of affairs with DCA

Ms. Magdel Boshoff is not prepared to elaborate on the matter. With regards to research, there is a specific arm within the Department who is responsible for research and will the matter be taken up with then.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

With regards to training – brief discussions with Thys de Wet and Niel Viljoen. Cape Nature also conducts training courses on control methods. Still need to coordinate training within the provinces, which is more a procedural issue.

6.2.3 Procedure when drafting provincial hunting proclamations

Each provincial department of Environmental Affairs gave a brief run-down on their hunting proclamations as it affects the norms and standards applied to vermin (jackal and lynx) in the provinces:

KwaZulu-Natal did not report and was Mr. Andy Blackmore requested to send the relevant information pertaining to specifically jackal and lynx to the Secretariat.

The Limpopo province indicated that they do not have a problem with jackal and that no system is in place.

Cape Nature, Western Cape operates a bit different to the other provinces. "Slagysters" (gin traps) is a prohibited hunting method in the Western Cape, with long-term permits being issued.

The Chairman questioned the operation in the Western Cape, because current legislation stipulates the use of a gin trap on porcupines, jackal and caracal with a permit. He pointed out that this type of inconsistency between provinces is exactly the reason why norms and standards should be standardised in all the provinces.

Mr. Jaco van Deventer replied that the Act addressed the control of prohibited methods – it is not about the animal that is killed. The permit issued is about the hunting method. That is the process followed in the Western Cape.

6.3 Other

6.3.1 Municipalities

Mr. Coligny Stegmann enquired about the role and responsibility of Municipalities on predator management.

Decision: Farmers' Unions need to negotiate with own municipalities – many options such as bounty systems available.

7. CLOSURE

Mr. Gert Loggenberg closed the meeting with prayer. The meeting concluded at 12:25."

The Federal Wildlife Services, USDA/APHIS extended an official invitation[829] on 3 May 2010 to Prof. HO de Waal, Mr. Coligny Stegmann, Dr. Nico Avenant, Mrs. Magdel Boshoff and Mr. Keith Ramsay to visit the Wildlife Services in the USA. As part of the preparatory process, copies of valid passports were required for security reasons, because the group would only be allowed to enter official USA premises after prior security clearance.

The group that departed on 15 May 2010 for the USA, comprised Mrs. Magdel Boshoff (DEAT), Mr. Coligny Stegmann (PMF/SAMGA), Dr. Nico Avenant (National Museum, Bloemfontein) and Prof. HO de Waal (ALPRU/UFS). The latter has kept a record of official engagements from 17–28 May 2010, namely:

"Keeping track of activities of the South African Group from 15 to 31 May 2010 while visiting the USA

Monday 17 May 2010

- *The group was picked up at the Comfort Suites Hotel by Michael Marlow and driven to the National Wildlife Research Centre at the outskirts of Ft Collins, CO.*

[829] Official letter signed by Dr. Dale Nolte, Assistant Coordinator for International Programs, National Wildlife Disease Program, USDA/APHIS/Wildlife Services.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 7.0

- *The first part of the morning was devoted to a broad background was presented by Larry Clark (Director National Wildlife Research Centre, USDA-APHIS) on the 15 research programmes conducted by the NWRC in the USA. Jeff Green (Regional Director USDA-APHIS Wildlife Services) gave an overview of the activities of his group in the Western USA.*
- *After tea HO de Waal presented the South African scenario which was attended by a good audience of NWRC staff. The presentation was followed by questions from the audience. Nico Avenant gave an impromptu short review (article in preparation) of the documented situation (past and current situation) regarding research on the Canis mesomelas and Caracal caracal in South Africa.*
- *The afternoon was devoted to an overview by Magdel Boshoff of the current process in South Africa regarding the drafting of the National Norms and Standards and the interactions between National and Provincial competencies.*
- *In addition, present in the smaller group was Guy Connolly (retired Wildlife Biologist) and the South African group appreciated his views on predation management, based on a wealth of knowledge and experience on predation and specifically the coyote.*
- *Guy Connolly eluded specifically on the Animal Damage Control Act (7 U.S.C. §§ 426-426c, March 2, 1931, as amended 1987 and 1991). This ADC Act informs the mandate of the Wildlife Services and as stated in its Overview "This Act gives the Secretary of Agriculture broad authority to investigate and control certain predatory or wild animals and nuisance mammal and bird species." Of particular interest is the Historical Note: "Public Law 99-190, approved in 1985, transferred administration of the Act from the Secretary of the Interior to the Secretary of Agriculture."*
- *Also present was Peter Orwick (Executive Director American Sheep Industry Association).*

Tuesday 18 May 2010

- *Started the morning at the NWRC with a talk by Stephanie Shwiff (Project Leader, Research Economist) on estimating the real impact of predation in terms of job losses and the multiplier effect. She specifically referred to the super simulation programme IMPLAN [Impact Analysis for Planning].*
- *Kathleen Fagerstone (Research Manager Invasive Species and Technology Development) elaborated on the use of the M-44 (spring-fired mechanism with an orange-dyed NaCN) and "Gonacon" a drug that blocks the normal hormonal flux to provide the sexual reproduction cycle.*
- *Tom DeLiberto (National Wildlife Disease Coordinator and the National Wildlife Disease Surveillance & Emergency Response Program) gave an overview of the work conducted by his group of 44 staff in the USA. Of note is the active oral delivery of rabies vaccines to racoons (cookies dropped from aircraft and helicopters).*
- *Richard Engeman (Research Biometrician) entertained us with the methods used to do the tracking plots and wildlife indexing.*
- *Later Gail Keirn (PRO of NRWC) and Kathleen Fagerstone took the afternoon the group on a tour of the restricted laboratory facilities of the NWRC.*
- *Later the afternoon, Michael Marlow took the group in the Wildlife Services Chevrolet Microbus via Cheyenne, WY to Casper, WY; the group visited the famous Boot Barn Live West. On route, the vehicle passed within 10 to 15 km from a tornado. Then the group drove through a heavy hailstorm. The group booked into the Hilton Garden Inn in Casper, WY.*

Wednesday 19 May 2010

- *The day started with an early breakfast meeting at the Hilton Garden Inn with Rod Krischke, WS Wyoming State Director. The rest of the morning was spent with Rod*

Version 5.0 – Made with Version 5.0

Krischke and Bryce Reece, Executive Vice President of the Wyoming Growers Association at his offices. The Rambouillet is a popular wool producing sheep breed.

- *At the Casper, WY airport, the group was introduced to the Wildlife Services pilot Jerry and his brand new yellow twin seater Top Cub Cessna. This fixed wing aircraft is used for aerial shooting of predators, mostly coyotes, with a 12-bore shotgun.*

Thursday 20 May 2010

- *The group drove from the Crystal Inn in West Valley City to the HQ of the Utah Department of Agriculture and Food. HO de Waal presented the South African scenario to the meeting. Present were Kyle Stephens (Deputy Commissioner), Michael Linnell (Utah State Director), Jared Zierenberg (Northern Utah District Supervisor), Gerrold Richins Utah Wool Growers Association, Douglas Livingston (Executive Secretary, Utah Wool Growers Association), Brent Tanner Executive Director Utah Cattle Association and Sterling Brown (Vice President, Farm Bureau).*

Friday 21 May 2010

- *The group stopped at the impressive statues of a coyote family at the entrance to the Logan Field Station of the Wildlife Services, National Wildlife Research Centre.*
- *After brief introductions, HO de Waal presented the South African scenario to the meeting in the library of the Logan Predator Research Station which was hosted by Eric Gese (Research Wildlife Biologist), Fred Knowlton (retired founder of the Field Station), and Patrick Darrow. The group enjoyed a burger that was made by everyone himself or herself from patties barbequed on a gas BBQ. The group was taken on a tour of the facilities with 96 adult (plus about 24 pups) captive coyotes (Canis latrans). The visit ended with a guided tour through the workshop where traps, snares, and other related equipment are modified and tested.*
- *Discussions from about 16h00 to 17h00 at the Utah State University with Johan du Toit (Professor and Head Department of Wildland Resources). He is also heading the Jack H. Berryman Institute of Wildlife Damage Management, which funds about 6 to 8 undergraduate students at various universities.*

Saturday 22 May 2010

- *Drove early the morning from Logan, UT to Salt Lake City, UT. Michael Marlow, the excellent host of the South Africans for the past week, said his goodbyes and left by road (about a seven-hour drive) back to Ft Collins, CO.*
- *The group departed with U S Airways from the Salt Lake City International Airport to the Phoenix International Airport in the southern outskirts of Phoenix, AZ. The group was picked up at the airport by Mark Gonzalez and taken to the Homewood Suites Hotel in a northern suburb of Phoenix, AZ.*

Sunday 23 May 2010

- *Mark Gonzalez picked the group up at the Homewood Suites Hotel at 06h00. The group first drove north to Flagstaff were they turned west and had breakfast at McDonald's of Bellemont, AZ located at a truck stop along the interstate. They stopped at a campsite in the Kaibab National Park (near Williams) and spent some time with David Bergman and his wife Trisha and kids in their 6 000 kg Sierra camper. The group then went to the Grand Canyon and took one of the Tourist Buses on the Blue Route. Later the group returned to their vehicle and drove to Flagstaff where they arrived at 15h30 at the Walnut Canyon. They proceeded down the 240 steps and dropped down from the general altitude 2 134 m to the cave dwellings of a well-known Native American Tribe.*

Monday 24 May 2010

- *Chris Carrillo (District Supervisor) and John Paul Semen (Wildlife Biologist from Poland, OH, being mentored for a week by David Bergman in preparation for a post of a state director), picked up the group at the Homewood Suites Hotel. Dave Bergman (Arizona State Director) joined the group and travelled via Dave's house to the new*

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

offices of the Arizona Game and Fish Department. Larry Voyles Director AGFD met the group. Also present were Brian Wakeling (Game Branch Chief), Sharen Adams (AGFD Field Operations Coordinator), Ron Day (Predator-Furbearer Biologist) and Terry Johnson (AGFD Endangered Species Coordinator). After coffee and doughnuts, HO de Waal presented the South African scenario. The presentation was followed by questions from the audience. Magdel Boshoff provided some background of the current process in South Africa regarding the drafting of National Norms and Standards and the interactions between National and Provincial competencies. Nico Avenant gave impromptu a very brief summary of an article in preparation of the documented situation (past and current situation) regarding research on the Canis mesomelas and Caracal caracal in South Africa.

- *The afternoon the group met with Dr. John Hunt (State Veterinarian, Arizona Department of Agriculture), Dwayne Dobson (Dobson Family Farms), Basilio "Bas" Aja (Director Arizona Cattlemen's Association, Executive Vice-President Arizona Cattle Feeders' Association, Executive Director Arizona Beef Council) and Patrick Bray (Deputy Director of Government Affairs Arizona Cattlemen's Association), at the offices of the Arizona Cattle Growers Association. The group briefly introduced themselves and HO de Waal gave some background on the reasons for the visit to the USA. Nico Avenant, Coligny Stegmann and Magdel Boshoff participated with input to questions from the group. Magdel Boshoff reviewed the process regarding the drafting of National Norms and Standards and the interactions between National and Provincial competencies in South Africa.*

Tuesday 25 May 2010

- *The morning the group was picked up at the Homewood Suites Hotel by Chris Carrillo and John Paul Semen and drove to the offices of the Arizona Wildlife Services. Dave Bergman welcomed them. In the storeroom of the Wildlife Services Chris Carrillo, Dave Bergman and John Paul Semen gave impromptu demonstrations of various traps and specialised equipment used by them, including the Victor Conibear quick-kill trap used to catch beaver by Wildlife Services. The South Africans, Nico Avenant, Coligny Stegmann, Magdel Boshoff and HO de Waal could see first-hand how specialists expertly handled important tools in the toolbox of the predation management.*
- *After a 2-hour flight with U S Airways, the group arrived in San Antonio, TX, picked up at the San Antonio Airport by Mike Bodenchuk (State Director Texas Wildlife Services), and booked in at the Omni San Antonio Hotel.*
- *While the group enjoyed steaks, Mike Bodenchuk provided some information on the activities of Wildlife Services in Texas.*

Wednesday 26 May 2010

- *The group was picked up by Mike Bodenchuk at the Omni San Antonio Hotel and took them to Wildlife Services offices nearby. They met Vivian Prothro Biologist San Antonio, Ruth Luna Assistant to the State Director and Randy Smith Biologist San Antonio. Again, HO de Waal presented the South African scenario with questions from Mike Bodenchuk, Vivian Prothro, and Randy Smith. Magdel Boshoff provided some background of the current process in South Africa regarding the drafting of National Norms and Standards and the interactions between National and Provincial competencies. Nico Avenant gave impromptu a very brief summary of an article in preparation of the documented situation (past and current situation) regarding research on the Canis mesomelas and Caracal caracal in South Africa.*
- *Discussions were continued. Mike Bodenchuk and Randy Smith provided ample background on the Texas Wildlife Services Program with an extended PowerPoint presentation.*
- *Mike Bodenchuk took the group to his smallholding where they joined his wife Debbie Bodenchuk and their two children Lee-Anne and Hunter, who is resigning at the*

Version 5.0 HO de Waal - Version 5.0

end of May 2010 as a trapper with Wildlife Services and endeavours to become a TV film director. Mike Bodenchuk briefed the group on the different traps and how to set them appropriately. The group was treated to a BBQ supper and good company.

Thursday 27 May 2010

- *Picked up at the Omni San Antonio Hotel and travelled to Kerrville and met Bob Sims the Kerrville District Supervisor and some staff, namely Jude Sandoval the Assistant District Supervisor, Elaine Moore the Office Manager Kerrville, Ronnie Henderson, Trapper and Kerrville District Trouble Shooter and Bill Cantwell, Trapper Gillespie County.*
- *HO de Waal travelled with Bob Sims in his Chevrolet 4x4 truck to the 5 BR Ranch in Gillespie County, along with Jude Sandoval and Ronnie Henderson. The group met with the rancher Billy Roeder who is also the Commissioner for Precinct 2, Gillespie County (one of four elected commissioners and a Mayor).*
- *The group travelled to the YO Ranch, Kerrville, TX and met Ricky Kay, the headhunter. Among other wildlife, the YO Ranch offers blue wildebeest, gemsbok, eland, blesbok and kudu for hunting.*
- *Michael Pacheco, Airport Biologist, San Antonio and his wife Angie a private veterinarian took the group into downtown San Antonio for sightseeing along the San Antonio Riverwalk. The group enjoyed dinner at Boudro's Texas Bistro on the Riverwalk, along the bank of the San Antonio River. After dinner, the group viewed the historical Alamo, dating back to the famous Battle of the Alamo in 1836 during the struggle of Texas for gaining independence from Mexico in 1938.*

Friday 28 May 2010

- *Travelled with Mike Baethge the Trapper of Kerrville District to the Hillingdon Ranch (20 000 acres) near Comfort, Kendell County, and met Robin and Carol Giles and their son Grant Giles. In addition to being an Angora goat rancher in the Texas Hill Country, Robin Giles is a Commodity Board member.*
- *At 14h30 the party was back at the offices of the Wildlife Services where Randy Smith gave an overview of the Management Information System of the Wildlife Services. Thereafter, discussions were aimed at debriefing, checking on missing information and completion of objectives. At 15h00 a telephonic conference was conducted on the road ahead: Michael Bodenchuk, Randy Smith, Nico Avenant, Coligny Stegmann, Magdel Boshoff, and HO de Waal in the conference room of the Wildlife Services San Antonio with Dale Nolte (Ft Collins, CO), Michael Marlow (Ft Collins, CO) and David Bergman (Phoenix, AZ)."*

During a very short, but well-planned itinerary of only 10 days, the 4-person team (broadly representing the PMF, the scientific fraternity and conservation authorities) experienced first-hand how a well-structured system of coordinated predation management was operating. Since, several PowerPoint presentations on their findings have been made during feedback sessions at different forums, including the PMF. The information and recommendations focused on the need for a system of coordinated predation management in South Africa and that ideally it should be government based.

Thus far, the initiative has been characterized by a well-represented and balanced delegation either when presenting the case to politicians and officials or when interacting abroad with specialist and gathering information. It is important to build on these successes.

On Tuesday 27 July 2010, the so-called Predation Research Management Committee convened at the NWGA Head Office in Port Elizabeth. Excerpts (translation) of the draft minutes are quoted below:

Version 5.0 HO de Waal - Version 5.0

"Attendance list: Amie Aucamp (Wool Industry Acting Chairman), Leon de Beer (Wool industry), Andre Strydom (Cape Wools SA), Gerhard Schutte (Red Meat Industry), Philip Vosloo (Mohair Industry), Reinhardt Holtzhausen (Wildlife Industry), Arthur Rudman (Wildlife Industry), Magdel Boshoff (Department of Environmental Affairs), Keith Ramsay (Department of Agriculture) and Bonita Francis (Secretary).

1. OPENING AND WELCOME

Dr. Amie Aucamp opened the meeting with a prayer and all present introduced them.

3. BACKGROUND AND AIM OF THE MEETING

4. CO-OPERATIVE RESEARCH PROGRAMME (CRP)

4.1 Aim of the CRP

4.2 Proposed CRP

Dr. Amie Aucamp elaborated in detail on the background to the founding of the CRP (Co-operative Research Programme). Service delivery structures are very fragmented (national and nine provincial departments), the public sector is not conducting research on this aspect and universities are involved on an ad hoc basis in this type of research, therefore it became necessary to find a national research programme. The four industries also have research trusts with limited funds available for research. Efforts are made to coordinate research in a meaningful way with representation of different industries on the respective research trusts.

The challenges regarding predators forced the industries to address the problem jointly, which led to the founding of the Predation Management Forum (PMF). Questions arose as to ways to prevent the fragmented approach and can the PMF be assisted to address problematic situations in a scientific way. The concept of the CRP arose and exclusively conducts research on black-backed jackal and caracal.

The principle of the CRP was also discussed and accepted at the previous PMF meeting.

Another advantage of the CRP was that research institutions might submit applications for additional funding from THRIP (Trade & Industry).

Discussions on the principles of CRP: (1) Mr. Arthur Rudman was very pleased with the idea of CRP, which was a more professional approach. From the farmers' point of view, there are two systems namely the biological one to be done by scientists and the bounty system, which was very successful previously; (2) Mr. Keith Ramsay supported the principle because he was involved with other CRP's which are managed well. It is important to focus on specific aspects. The reality is that if nothing is done soon, there will be no products to sell. The DAFF has signed MOU's with institutions and the procedure is working well (e.g. Water Research Commission); (3) Mr. Philip Vosloo bought in on the CRP concept, but it must be sold to the organised industries with the request to allocate funds in advance; (4) Mr. Andre Strydom did not see much problems and requested that the administrative process must not be seen as a too restrictive. The role of the CRP was to give guidance and coordinate and the concept was accepted by CWSA and the Wool Trust; (4) Mrs. Magdel Boshoff supported the principle, but the concept must now be sold to the national and provincial departments. She has discussed it with her manager and was waiting for a written proposal from Petrus de Wet. A research fund has also been identified as a "key area" – it is possible but not easy. There is an example in Environmental Affairs where DEA has contributed on a 'rand-for-rand' to a project, namely the 'Baboon Management Project' in the Peninsula; and (6) Mr. Reinhardt Holtzhausen supported the principle, but the implementation may be problematic because of limited funds.

Decision: the concept of CRP was approved in principle.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

5 FEEDBACK/VIEW FROM THE PMF

No feedback was given because most representatives have attended the PMF meeting and the minutes have been circulated.

6 IMPLEMENTATION OF CRP

6.1 Management Committee

The meeting discussed the composition of the current Committee, which was representative of the industries and the national departments. Additional to the members was Mr. Andre Strydom, CWSA, the representative organisation of the wool industry. It was necessary to expand the committee to include other role players.

Remarks: (1) The relevant organisations must add value to the Committee and contribute to funding the CRP; and (2) Scientists are not included at this level; CRP members must manage the system[830].

Proposal of possible additional members: (1) World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF). DAFF was already working with them on other projects and cooperation was good (Dr. Du Plessis); (2) Green Choice – Red Meat Industry is familiar with this organisation and they have recently signed off on the RPO Code of Best Practices. It was a moderate grouping with collective representation (WWF is also part of them) (Heidi Hawkins); (3) Endangered Wildlife Trust (EWT) – relations with local national organisations (Tim Snow); and (4) Livestock Welfare Coordinating Committee (LWCC) – is representative of the organisations names above (Prof. Gareth Bath).

Mr. Andre Strydom proposed that the mandates and goals of these organisations are requested before they are invited.

Decision: (1) The meeting was satisfied with the broad framework as proposed; and (2) The LWCC would be invited initially to serve on the CRP Management Committee.

6.2 Organogram and tasks

Dr. Amie Aucamp referred to the Organogram and specifically the Management Committee; the latter must translate and manage research needs in an action plan.

The focus for year 1 was: (1) Current extension and training programme of the NWGA to continue (supported by red meat mohair industries); (2) Scientific assessment must be conducted followed by guiding research. It will eliminate loose statements; (3) Socioeconomic study – to address specifically the reasons for the rapid increase of the black-backed jackal and caracal populations; (4) Spatial and demographic dynamics of predators – get clarification on the statement that nature reserves and wildlife ranches are the breeding grounds for black-backed jackal and caracal; and (5) Assessment identified research – research priorities identified by the scientific assessment. It will provide guidance for future research projects. There is no training material and the lectures by Niel Viljoen must be accredited. It also includes training courses for hunting methods. Die scientific assessment must have priority.

6.3 Funding

Red meat industry

Mr. Gerhard Schutte foresaw problems regarding the funding and that the CRP will not be easily feasible in the red meat industry. There are 2 sources for funding from the value chain of 13 sectors (only 2 for producers) and there are specific structures deciding on the merits of research projects. He is not negative towards the principle of the CRP but has specific reservations that government will necessarily contribute on a rand-for-

[830] Editor's Note: This remark was quite interesting.

Version 5.0 - PhD de Waal - Version 5.0

rand basis – there is no example of such a scheme in the livestock industry. Contributions from the RPO will probably be on a project basis and about R80 000 per project may be considered.

Sources for funding: (1) Red Meat Research and Development Trust (RMRDT) – R1.5m/year and the term runs from January–December; (2) Statutory levy – R3m/year – November – October; and (3) From the statutory levy fund allocations are made towards "Production Development" – the RPO has the sole mandate on the spending of these funds.

Cape Wools SA

Mr. Andre Strydom explained that primary funding comes from the Wool Trust. Business plans which include money for research are submitted annually. Thus there are no funds specifically earmarked only for research.

A second possible source for financing which may be explored is the SAWAMBA levy subtracted from wool farmers. The money is used for specific objectives among other local promotions. A considerable surplus has accrued which may possibly be used for the CRP. Initially there must be between SAWAMBA and NWGA because the money is controlled by CWSA requiring a decision by the Board of Directors.

Wildlife industry

Mr. Reinhardt Holtzhausen explained that the Wildlife Ranching SA has no levies or trust fund and income is generated solely by membership fees. Research represents only a small part of the budget which is directed at wildlife ranching.

Mr. Arthur Rudman said that Wildlife Ranching SA is a young organisation with limited funding – their only source of funding is membership fees. However, there are ways and means of sourcing funds: (a) Safari Club International; and (b) International expertise to participate in projects.

DAFF

Mr. Keith Ramsay said it is positive that research needs come from 1 coordinated body represented by all the livestock industries and national departments.

Sources of funding: (1) Directorate for Research and Development. Projects can be funded by MOU's. Look at short term projects (base line studies). Chief Director can approve the funding. It is now much easier to sign agreements with CRP and not individual organisations; (2) Education and Training is also division of DAFF – also possible funding there; (3) Research fund – long term planning. Programme has R9m to get projects off the ground; (4) Employment Creation fund (Rural Development) – there are certain possibilities; (5) US Aid (they approach SA and seek guidance about financial assistance); and (6) FAO (require collective presentation).

Mohair industry

Mr. Philip Vosloo explained that their funding was originally via Mohair SA. SAMGA now has direct access to the Trust – direct access with more leeway to state their case directly. They have a Mohair Research Committee which handle and coordinate projects.

As a result of the negative impact on production and its priority, it was decided in principle to keep funds for research separately. It is necessary to continue and on 5 August 2010 a proposal must be submitted regarding the mechanism for funding.

Department of Environmental Affairs

Mrs. Magdel Boshoff explained that no fund exists in the Dept. Her chief director is interested but awaits a submission from Petrus de Wet. However, there are other possible sources which may be explored, namely: (1) Expanded Public Works Programme which focus on the underlying social responsibility and job creation. Training of farm workers and the previously disadvantaged in for example trapping is a possibility. These funds may possibly also be used to replace banned traps and training with new traps. The funds can possibly also used for the training currently provided by Niel Viljoen. She is of the opinion that accreditation is not a requirement. The procedure for funding

Version 5.0 – MS Word – Version 5.0

can be obtained by her – Social Disability Branch is the responsible division; and (2) Global Environmental Fund (GEF) – the World Bank provides funds to address different key areas; she was not sure how it was administrated.

6.4 Cost estimate

The meeting discussed the cost estimate of R3 726 million for Year 1, namely:

Extension	*R 600 000*
Assessment	*R 1 870 000*
Socio economic drivers	*R 350 000*
Spatial & demographic dynamics of predators	*R 1 020 000*
NMMU levy	*R 486 000*

Mr. Reinhardt Holtzhausen requested that expropriated land be added to the Spatial & demographic dynamics of predators; it is a big problem because there is no control on such land.

Decision: (1) The cost estimate was accepted but a cash flow system must be developed; (2) Environmental Affairs –possible funding for the CRP may only be forthcoming from April 2011; (3) Agriculture – the money is available and the process must now be initiated. Project proposal must be submitted to Mr. Keith Ramsay. An MOU can possibly be agreed with NMMU. Mr. Ramsay will provide the necessary documents to Dr. Aucamp; (4) RPO – Mr. Gerhard Schutte has the necessary information to negotiate with the structures; (5) Industries must investigate in their managements how money can be made available; (6) CWSA and SAMGA must discuss mechanisms for funding; (7) The Assessment is priority must be implemented as soon as possible; and (8) Any additional information and support are available at the NWGA Head Office to accelerate the process.

7. APOINTMENT OF LEAD RESEARCH ORGANISATION

Implementing Lead Partner

It was proposed that the Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University (NMMU) be used as lead partner, because they have an institute with infrastructure and an advantage is that it is close the NNWGA.

Mr. Gerhard Schutte caution against putting the function at only 1 institution and asked why it could not be done at the Bloemfontein University?

Dr. Amie Aucamp explained NMMU will only coordinate the action. Any research institution can submit research proposals for consideration. Mr. Keith Ramsay said the Water Research Committee also operated in this way.

Decision: The Committee approved the NMMU as Lead Research Organisation.

8. OTHER MATTERS

8.1 Training

8.2 Accreditation

The meeting was in agreement that arrangements with the training program were continued as well as its accreditation.

8.3 Electing a Chairman

Mr. Gerhard Schutte proposed that the chairman be elected from the NWGA because of the mutual agreement that the RPO will handle livestock theft and the NWGA the problem animal forum; therefore he proposed Dr. Amie Aucamp as chairman. The proposal was seconded unanimously.

Decision: Dr. Amie Aucamp was elected as chairman of the Management Committee.

8.4 Name of Committee

It was changed to Management Committee for Cooperative Research Programme."

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

The quest by ALPRU to obtain information on the impact of predation in South Africa was stepped up during 2006/7. Van Niekerk (2010)[831] developed a structured questionnaire to survey sheep and goat farmers in five provinces by telephone. The results suggested that the annual predation losses were much larger than commonly believed. Excerpts from the abstract of this third study under the auspices of ALPRU's CCP are quoted below:

> *"The primary objective of this study was to quantify the economic losses due to predation on small livestock and further to analyse the effect of various managerial aspects on the occurrence and level of predation on small livestock farms.*
>
> *The five major small livestock producing provinces (Eastern Cape, Northern Cape, Free State, Western Cape and Mpumalanga) were used to collect primary data on predation. Telephonic interviews were used to collect data from 1 424 farmers in the five major small livestock producing provinces. The questionnaire included questions on farm name, location and size, flock size, topography, surrounding land uses, livestock losses due to predators, predator control and various managerial aspects.*
>
> *The majority of losses in these five provinces were small livestock younger than one month, where the black-backed jackal was responsible for the majority of the predation. Losses due to caracal were not as high compared with black-backed jackal. This is mainly ascribed to lower population levels of caracals and that these damage-causing animals are not found in every region within a province. Losses due to caracal were associated with lambs or kids older than a month, as well as older small livestock.*
>
> *Predation losses due to predators was estimated at R1 390 453 062 when extrapolating predation losses for the five provinces to the rest of South Africa. The Northern Cape Province reported the highest predation losses, namely R540 847 496. The reported predation losses for the other four provinces were R412 810 143 for the EC province, R247 141 016 for the FS province, R84 673 440 for the MP province and R104 980 967 for the WC province. The physical monetary value attached to predation in this study was only the direct cost of predation and do not include indirect cost of controlling damage-causing animals.*
>
> *The monetary losses as presented previously were based on biological information provided by respondents for the five major small livestock producing provinces. For example in the NC province, 426 farmers were surveyed, representing 6.9% of commercial farmers in the province. These farmers were farming on 3 290 790 ha and lost on average 6.14% of their total small livestock and 13% of production animals (lambs between 0 – 6 months). The majority of losses were associated with predation by the black-backed jackal (65%) and to a lesser extent predation by the caracal (30%). Other losses experienced on farms were attributed to stock theft (3%) and vagrant dogs (1%)."*

Van Niekerk (2010) then concluded:

> "*The information collected in this study showed that predation is a serious problem for the South African small livestock sector and there is also no indication that the level of predation is subsiding. This study does not answer all questions on predation, but provides valuable information in understanding the magnitude or extent of predation and some of the factors influencing predation on farms. The information collected can be used to select and evaluate smaller areas intensively in their effort to manage predation and develop strategies accordingly."*

[831] Van Niekerk, Hermias Nicolaas, 2010. The cost of predation on small livestock in South Africa by medium-sized predators. M.Sc. Agric. dissertation. University of the Free State, Bloemfontein, South Africa.

Version 5.0 – PD de Waal, Version 5.0

On 15 September 2010, Prof. HO de Waal gave a presentation[832] on the Canis-Caracal Programme and predation management to a provincial hunting association in Bloemfontein, Free State Province.

On 16 September 2010, Prof. HO de Waal gave a presentation[833] at the RPO National Congress at the Rosewood Mount Grace, Magaliesburg (Gauteng Province) and provided feedback on the recent visit to the USA ("*Coordinated predation management in South Africa – lessons to be learnt*"). Based on first-hand experience gained during this visit, the RPO leadership and a wide representation of cattle, sheep and goat farmers were urged to assist in implementing a system of coordinated predation management in South Africa.

Information leaked about the closed meeting, which was held on 27 July 2010, and it was widely discussed. It appeared that two separate processes with broadly similar goals were underway in South Africa. On 18 September 2010, Prof. HO de Waal deemed it necessary to send the following e-mail to a wide range of colleagues:

"*Hallo dear friends*

At the recent National Congress of the RPO, several individuals enquired about "the project" currently conducted regarding predation. Specifics of the questions differed, but generally, inference was made that "the project" was conducted under the auspices of the wool industry. It was also alleged that a university has been mandated to conduct the research and that a huge budget has been submitted or even approved? Rumour has it that the budget exceeds R3.5 million with a levy for the university running just short of R0.5 million?

I am aware of at least one meeting during July 2010 or thereabouts where such a decision might have been taken. When the questions were put at the RPO Congress memory failed me on the specific detail of decisions taken by the PMF on 20 and 21 April 2010 at its meetings in Bloemfontein [I have since studied the minutes]. However, I did recall advising the PMF of the importance of the producer organisations becoming actively involved but that government should be the "face" of predation. On the same principle, it was also advised that universities should not be seen as running the operations of a predation control initiative or provides a secretariat to the PMF. However, this role should not be confused with the distinct scientific role of universities to conduct credible research. It was also advised that despite limited funding being made available by the constituting PMF members, the secretariat of the PMF should from the start assume a very neutral and official position. At least one such government institution was suggested for consideration.

The advantage of government being the "face" of the predation management was adequately demonstrated by the Wildlife Services of the USDA during the study tour to the USA. We should not deviate from this principle in our endeavours.

Universities will conduct much of the envisaged research. Therefore, the timing of the next annual PMF meeting to consider and approve applications for funding of research projects (in line with the PMF vision) is problematic for universities. It was proposed that September would be better and in line with the academic year for universities with a view to source funding and recruit prospective postgraduate students. The expectation was

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

[832] De Waal, HO, 2010. Recent advances in the quest for a coordinated predation management system in South Africa. Interacting with the USDA-APHIS Wildlife Services and other role players in Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Arizona and Texas from 17-28 May 2010. Vrystaatse Jagters- en Wildbewaringsvereniging. 15 September 2010. Lettie Fouché Lapa, Bloemfontein, South Africa.

[833] De Waal, HO, 2010. Coordinated predation management system in South Africa – lessons to be learnt. Interacting with the USDA-APHIS Wildlife Services and other role players in Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Arizona and Texas from 17-28 May 2010. 23rd National Congress – Red Meat Producers' Organisation. 16 September 2010. Mount Grace Country House, Magaliesburg, Gauteng Province, South Africa.

created that a formal call for submissions of relevant research projects would be forthcoming via the PMF secretariat? It would now seem that an opportunity was lost?

It was envisaged that the study tour to the USA will play an important role and assist in informing the road ahead? There is no doubt: lessons learnt will advance the local process to reach new levels if taken seriously and urgently. Granted, currently organs of state still lack a shared vision on the need for a coordinated system of predation management. However, this should not be allowed to side line or deflate our general vision, approach, or enthusiasm.

The alleged initiative referred to previously will put a severe constraint on scarce financial and human resources and delay much needed and urgent progress. It will also be a real tragic waste and a pity if the investment and efforts made by colleagues during the visit in May 2010 to the USA is not taken serious and capitalised on urgently.

A position must be reached urgently where the organ of state responsible for driving a coordinated predation management system has no regulatory function. It may be argued that the state currently simply has no capacity or expertise to drive a system of coordinated predation management. This can be debated, but government has the necessary funds. There are also still a few skilled and experienced staff members in different departments and provinces that may be seconded (while staying at their current locations) to start the ball rolling. As the process gains momentum the numbers of the core group may be expanded. In the national interest and as an interim arrangement, government may also consider contracting expertise to develop and operate a system during a period of three to five years and have the system established and operating in a government department.

We need to do a lot of lobbying."

The Steering Committee of the Predation Management Forum (PMF) met on Wednesday 13 October 2010 at the NWGA Head Office, Newton Park, Port Elizabeth. Excerpts of the minutes are quoted below:

"Attendance: Petrus de Wet (NWGA/Chairman), Leon de Beer (NWGA General Manager), Amie Aucamp (NWGA Deputy General Manager), Coligny Stegmann (SA Mohair Growers' Association), Gerhard Grobler (SA Mohair Growers' Association) Lardus van Zyl (RPO, Large Stock Industry), Gerhard Schutte (RPO, Small Stock Industry), Arthur Rudman (Wildlife Ranching SA), Keith Ramsay (Nat. Dept. Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, DAFF), HO de Waal (ALPRU) and Adele Rhode (Secretariat).

1. OPENING AND WELCOME

Mr. Gerhard Grobler opened the meeting with prayer. Mr. Petrus de Wet welcomed all present.

2. APOLOGIES

Dr. Nico Avenant, National Museum: Bloemfontein, Mr. Reinhardt Holtzhausen, Wildlife Ranching SA and Ms. Magdel Boshoff, Dept. of Environmental Affairs.

3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the 2nd meeting of the Management Committee, held on 20 April 2010 at Haldon Estate, Bloemfontein, was accepted, subject to the following amendments on the proposal of Mr. Gerhard Grobler and seconded by Mr. Coligny Stegmann.

Page 6 last paragraph of 12.1 to read: Prof. HO De Waal reported briefly about the Biological control of predators.

The minutes of the Special Management Committee Meeting, held on 23 June 2010 at the Dept. of Agriculture, Pretoria, was accepted, subject to the following amendments on the proposal of Mr. Coligny Stegmann and seconded by Mr. Lardus van Zyl.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

Page 1: Jacques Malan to be removed from attendance list.

4. MATTERS FOR DISCUSSION

4.1 Co-operative Research Programme: Stock Predation Research

Dr. Aucamp discussed the importance and role of a Cooperative Research Program (CRP) for predation research. He referred to the fragmented approach to this problem, limited funds, lack of expertise on respective industry research committees, limited or no research conducted by government, other research which is not "peer reviewed", etc.

The importance of training to producers is a further serious shortfall, with no accredited training material and only Niel Viljoen currently conducting the training. The lack of national norms and standards furthermore contributes to the fact that provinces follow their own approaches to the problem.

The establishment of a CRP will provide the following solutions: (1) Inter-institutional and multi-disciplinary approach; (2) Collective funding and expertise; (3) National planning with decentralised implementation; and (4) Intercept fragmentation.

The principle of a CRP is not new.

The appointment of the "Center of African Conservation Ecology" (ACE) as "Lead Organisation" was recommended.

Reasons: (1) ACE has a strong infra-structure; (2) Track record of high scientific outputs; (3) National and International standing; and (4) Already operating as independent unit at NMMU according to CRP principles.

Framework of CRP already completed, as well as proposal on roll-out. Process to be guided by MOU.

An operational structure on how the CRP would operate was tabled and discussed, as well as a budget (initial estimate of R2.0 million/annum to be considered by industries involved) and potential sources of funding.

The roll-out plan includes the following: (1) Training (Already in place); (2) Scientific Assessment; (3) Socio-economic drivers; (4) Spatial and demographic dynamics of predators; (5) Assessment of research proposals, considering assessment.

4.1.1 Proposal for Scientific Assessment

Dr. Amie Aucamp made a presentation regarding the proposal for Scientific Assessment. The Scientific Assessment is considered as the first important step towards addressing the problem of predation, research and policy formulation (norms and standards).

The Scientific Assessment will: *(1) Conduct appropriate and strategically determined research; (2) Take into account the problems and needs of the livestock industry, environmental (ecological) requirements, and outcomes of acceptable research conducted to date; (3) Providing sound, scientifically-based directions (guidelines) to (a) the industry, and to (b) policymakers; (4) Aim of mitigating the problems caused by predation on livestock; and (5) Identify knowledge gaps.*

Three critical success factors: *(1)* ***Legitimacy****: process must be well-founded; (2)* ***Saliency****: relevant to an expressed need; and (3)* ***Credibility****: it must be conducted by experts to the highest standards.*

Focus themes: *(1) Background information and current trends; (2) Methods that have been, and are being used and their effectiveness; (3) Ethical, economical and legal issues; (4) Management systems; and (5 Critical research needs for the future.*

The following remarks were noted:

Mr Coligny Stegmann was concerned about the cost & time of the assessment as there are more burning issues to be dealt with in the short term.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

Mr. Lardus van Zyl felt that the Assessment is a duplication of research already done by Prof. HO de Waal.

Mr. Gerhard Schutte supports the concept of the Assessment but agrees with Mr. Coligny Stegmann regarding costs involved. Mr. Gerhard Schutte remarked that the committee should not look at the cheapest quote but the institution that has the best skills. He remarked that the budget has already been submitted to the Meat Industry Trust for financial consideration. Mr. Gerhard Schutte would like to request Dr. Amie Aucamp to make the necessary amendments to the concept document that has been submitted to the various industries.

Mr. Petrus de Wet clarified with Mr. Leon de Beer that the steering committee will decide on the detail, cost & quotations of the assessment. Mr. Petrus remarked that the steering committee accepts that a Scientific Assessment/Literacy Study must be done and that the committee look at getting a quotation from ALPRU and other universities.

Mr. Leon de Beer informed the committee that the proposal was developed by ACE. To request quotations from other institutions on this proposal would therefore be problematic. A literature study is something different to a scientific assessment.

Decision: The Steering Committee in principle accepts the structure and accepts that the first two levels of the organogram are in place.

The Steering Committee to look at narrower parameters & and put it out on tender.

The Steering Committee will give final go ahead as to which institution will be the service provider after feedback is received.

The rest of the levels in the organogram will then be put into place and the funding agencies contacted.

The concept document that has been submitted to the various industries must be amended as soon as possible. The specific name ACE/NMMU to be deleted and replaced with "a service provider from an academic institution who has tendered and decided on by the Steering Committee of this organisation".

4.2 Presentation by Prof. HO de Waal (The way forward)

Prof. HO de Waal's presentation[834] *entailed statistics of losses reported in 5 provinces during 2006. Prof. de Waal informed the committee that the terminology needs to be corrected (referring to Damage Causing Animals vs Predators). He also mentioned that the absence of Government with regards to predation is a major concern.*

Feedback: Study tour to the US Department of Agriculture. *(1) A Strong research leg with involvement from various institutions; (2) Research farms being used for research; (3) Equipment is constantly being improved to be more specific & humane; (4) Concentration on the emotions of the public, a point that is lacking in South Africa; and (4) Wildlife is a priority of the public.*

The following remarks were noted:

Mr. Petrus de Wet informed the committee that the points mentioned by Prof. de Waal is work currently being done.

The 3 priorities of the organisation *(1) Lobbying; (2) Training – Short term; and (3) Research – Long term.*

Mr. Petrus de Wet made the suggestion that the next agenda by drafted around these 3 priorities.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

[834] De Waal, HO, 2010. Coordinated predation management system in South Africa – the way forward. Interacting with the USDA-APHIS Wildlife Services and other role players in Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Arizona and Texas from 17-28 May 2010. Coordinated predation management in South Africa. Predation Management Forum. 13 October 2010. Port Elizabeth, South Africa.

Decision: Mr. Petrus de Wet will amend his presentation and make the necessary arrangements to meet with the Director General of Agriculture, the Portfolio Committee, the Minister of Agriculture & Mrs. Magdel Boshoff's newly appointed manager.

Report by Mr. Keith Ramsey

Mr. Keith Ramsey informed the committee that Grootfontein Agricultural Development Institute (GADI) was proposed as a centre for predator research. Mr. Ramsey will approach the Minister of Agriculture for support and mentioned that they are working closer with the Department of Environmental Affairs. Background information is also needed as a baseline.

The following remarks were noted:

Mr. Arthur Rudman feels that the government should start taking more responsibility. Bounty systems should be implemented. AgriSA structures should assist where necessary. The biological system should be correct.

Mr. Gerhard Grobler remarked that pressure should be put on government in order to get more funds. It is important to get the public on the producer's side, in order for the government to realise the importance of food security.

Decision: Committee accepts to support the Government in their proposal to use GADI as the centre for research.

4.1.2 Training programmes (arising)

Mr. Lardus van Zyl informed the Committee that predation training will be possible in the North West but Limpopo might be an issue. Mr. Leon de Beer foresees a financial implication regarding the travelling costs of the facilitator if training were to take place in the Limpopo Province. Mr. Gerhard Schutte made the suggestion that a written notification be sent out from the Predator Management Forum notifying the province of the availability of courses and they can give an indication of a suitable date.

Decision: (1) Mr. Gerhard Schutte, Mr Leon de Beer and Dr. Amie Aucamp will decide on when, where and whom will conduct the training; and (2) Mr. Gerhard Schutte and Mr. Leon de Beer will look at the options of conducting a course as well as funds relating to the course. If the need arises look at someone within or closer to the North West Province to present the course.

4.2 Norms and Standards

The norms and standards have not yet been published for comment.

Decision: The forum will wait until the norms & standards are published then decide on a date for a special management committee meeting, draft a pro forma and spread as wide as possible.

4.3 Representation to Parliament's Portfolio Committees (Agriculture & Environment)

Mr. Petrus de Wet drafted a letter to the Portfolio Committee regarding all the issues from the Forum.

Decision: The Steering Committee to attend a meeting of the Portfolio Committee on short notice when an appointment is confirmed.

4.4 Constitution

The Constitution was approved at the previous meeting and the necessary amendments have been made.

Decision: The Constitution is now an approved document that will be implemented and placed onto the Website.

Version 5.0 - Hoofwad - Versie 2.0

4.5 DAFF Submission to DEA (arising)

Mr. Keith Ramsay and Mr. Petrus de Wet have drafted a letter to be submitted to the Minister of DEA, which was delayed due to incorrect spacing. Mr. de Wet informed the committee that it has been communicated to him that the letter has been signed by the Minister of Agriculture 10 days ago.

4.6 Letterhead and Logo

For cognisance. Mr. Gerhard Grobler informed the committee that Mr. Niel Viljoen's presentation only displays the NWGA logo. Mr. Leon de Beer will follow up and communicate to the relevant staff. A suggestion made by Mr. Lardus van Zyl was to consider making banners with the PMF logo/4 organisations involved and this can be used at information days.

Decision: The PMF logo must be used on all presentations, letters, training material and courses (combined funding) that deals with Predation.

4.7 Public Awareness Campaign (arising)

Mr. Gerhard Grobler informed the committee that media companies are very expensive to use for advertising. He reiterated the importance of lobbying and awareness should be focused on non-governmental organisations, businesses, the end users and the entire value chain. Websites and the internet should be used more extensively.

4.8 NWGA Website – Link on Predation (Pictures)

Mr. Leon de Beer informed the meeting that new predation photos are regularly being placed onto the NWGA website and that the link has been created on the website. Mr. Coligny Stegmann informed the committee about a research website called www.jacaral.com that could be viewed by creating a link from the website. A question raised by Mr. Gerhard Schutte was that the link on the other organizations website be renamed "Predation" instead of NWGA.

5 MEETINGS

5.1 Next meeting of Management Committee

The date for the next meeting has not yet been finalised. A suggestion from Mr. Gerhard Schutte is to schedule the PMF dates around those of Agri SA for 2011.

Decision: PMF meeting dates to be scheduled around the Agri SA dates for 2011 and be included onto their calendar for 2011."

The Constitution of the Predation Management Forum was approved as amended[835] and ready for implementation and publication on the PMF website:

"PREDATION MANAGEMENT FORUM (PMF)

---

*1. **STATEMENT OF INTENT***

The Predation Management Forum (PMF) provides a platform for liaison and coordination of activities of commodity organisations in the livestock and game ranching sectors, aimed at reducing losses incurred as a result of predation by means of ecologically and ethically acceptable methods which protect the biodiversity of South Africa.

*2. **BACKGROUND***

[835] Paragraph **4.4 Constitution** – minutes of the PMF Steering Committee meeting, held on 13 October 2010 in Port Elizabeth.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

- *Predation has become a major cause of financial losses in the livestock and game ranching industries in South Africa. These losses are well in excess of R1 billion per annum.*
- *The rate of predation is increasing due to a series of contributing factors, with an associated increase in the financial impact on these industries as well as on food security.*
- *The industries affected by this problem do not exist and function in a vacuum, and it has become clear that all strategies and actions to address the problem require testing against the rule of law in South Africa, also recognizing the common law principle of the right of individuals to protect livelihoods and assets such as livestock and game.*
- *There is an increasing need to ensure that strategies developed to address the problem and strategies for the management of predation must be underpinned by sound, verifiable and testable science, performed by recognized R&D practitioners whose work must stand up to peer review.*
- *There is a large body of evidence developing which is signalling the urgent need for education and training at all levels in the value chain to ensure an understanding of the problem, and for developing capacity to implement appropriate tactics to address the problem.*
- *The media is becoming an increasingly popular vehicle for creating sensation and often for conveying ill-informed messages regarding this problem. This brings forward the urgent need for a coordinated and holistic approach to media relations to ensure that a balanced message is presented which is fair to all stakeholders.*
- *There is an urgent need to effectively engage with government (e.g. DEA and DAFF) to assist in the creation of an enabling environment for farmers to follow their chosen profession taking into account the national requirements for biodiversity.*
- *The fast developing nature of consumerism is such that there is a need to ensure that the overall strategies and activities of the PMF, in terms of issues such as animal welfare, are reflected in appropriately drafted and implemented Codes of Best Practice for the various sectors affected by this problem.*

*3. **TERMS OF REFERENCE OF THE PMF***

3.1 To develop a national policy and guidelines for a coordinated approach by the livestock and game industries in South Africa for the management of predation affecting the profitability of these sectors.

3.2 To provide a platform to develop an inclusive and representative communication strategy for interaction with government (national and provincial) as and when required and appropriate.

3.3 To act as a representative body for the establishment of a coordinated approach for communication with on-farm predation management practitioners in the livestock and game farming industries.

3.4 To act as a coordinating body for the establishment of a coordinated approach for communication with consumers, consumer organisations and retail to counteract negative perceptions based on a lack of information or misinformation.

3.5 To act as a facilitation mechanism to remove obstacles which prevent the effective protection of livestock and game farming assets.

3.6 To develop strategies for training and for credible and ethical R&D, and the securing of funding for these strategies.

*4. **COMPOSITION AND MEETINGS OF THE PMF***

4.1 All commodity organisations and/or producer associations representing the livestock and game farming industries which are affected by predation, are by default members of the PMF.

Version 5.0 – NO as Final Version 5.0

4.2 From all industries or industry organisations indicating their participation or their intention to participate in the activities of the Forum, a Steering Committee shall be constituted comprising at least one representative from each industry.

4.3 The Steering Committee shall from its members elect/nominate a chairman to serve a term to be fixed by mutual consent between the members of the Committee.

4.4 The secretariat of the PMF (and, by default, the Steering Committee) shall reside with the industry organisation which the chairman represents.

4.5 The PMF shall meet at least once per year at a venue and at a time to be communicated to all members at least 30 days prior to such a meeting.

4.6 The Steering Committee shall meet at least quarterly to deal with matters too urgent to postpone to a full PMF meeting.

4.7 All costs incurred in attending to the business of the PFM or the Steering Committee shall be for own account.

*5. **POLICY STATEMENTS AND GUIDELINES FOR THE FDCA***

5.1 The PMF endorses an approach which is scientifically based, biologically sound, environmentally safe and socially responsible.

5.2 The PMF recognises that conflict with predators is an inherent risk for farmers whose core business is livestock or game ranching. Management of losses caused by predators is part of farmers' and ranchers' production process, the primary responsibility which rests with the landowner or user.

5.3 The PMF acknowledges that the responsibility of government is the interest of the community as a whole. However, government has the responsibility to ensure that its mandate to maintain an overarching enabling environment in terms of legislation does not translate to discrimination against one or more sectors within the community.

5.4 The PMF subscribes to the core principle that the purpose of targeted predation management is the cost-effective reduction of losses, and not the eradication of species.

5.5 The PMF endorses all actions aimed at building an image for farmers and ranchers as responsible people who care for the biodiversity of South Africa and the environment in general.

5.6 The PMF's agreed philosophy for an effective predation management system is based on a simple, three-pronged approach, viz:

- *The adaptation of farm management practices to avoid losses.*
- *The repulsion or control of predators.*
- *The capture, documentation and promotion of Best Practice by means of sector-specific Codes appropriate for each sector and biosystem in which livestock or game farming enterprises are located.*

Bon/Sept 2010"

In a letter dated 28 October 2010, Mr. M.L. Johnson, Chairperson: Portfolio Committee on Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries cordially invited Mr. Petrus de Wet "*to appear before the committee to make an oral presentation on the impact of predation on the industry your organisation is representing. The meeting was to take place on Tuesday, 02 November 2010 in Committee Room E540, Fifth Floor, New Wing, Parliament from 09h00 – 13h45.*"

This meeting on 2 November 2010 in Parliament with the Portfolio Committee was a watershed event in the broad initiative for coordinated predation management in South Africa. The PMF delegation was led by Petrus de Wet (PMF Chairman/NWGA) and included Lardus van Zyl (RPO), Coligny Stegmann (SAMGA) and HO de Waal (UFS/ALPRU).

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

Since this meeting on 2 November 2010 with the Portfolio Committee in Parliament, it seemed that authorities (both politicians and officials) started viewing the united front presented by the PMF in a different light.

During a visit to the UFS, Mr. Petrus de Wet sought advice on establishing a Scientific Advisory Committee (SAC). Prof. HO de Waal suggested the rationale must be to incorporate a wider network of scientists to advise the PMF. It was suggested that Dr. Nico Avenant, a very competent ecologist of the National Museum in Bloemfontein, could act as convenor to start the process.

Mr. Petrus de Wet, Chairman of the PMF, extended the following invitation on 10 November 2010 to a group of scientists:

"Dear Sir/Madam

RESEARCH: STOCK PREDATION

1. The development of a strong and effective research program on sound and scientific management practices to protect livestock against predation has become a priority for livestock and wildlife farmers in an environment where many attacks are made by people with opposing views and approaches.

2. These opposing views and approaches are not always based on sound scientific principles and frequently used to discredit farmers and influence policy.

3. Against this background has the National Woolgrowers' Association of SA (NWGA), Red Meat Producers' Organisation (RPO), South African Mohair Growers' Association (SAMGA) and Wildlife Ranching SA formed the Predation Management Forum (PMF).

4. The Predation Management Forum (PMF) provides a platform for liaison and coordination of activities of commodity organisations in the livestock and game ranching sectors, aimed at reducing losses incurred as a result of predation by means of ecologically and ethically acceptable methods which protect the biodiversity of South Africa.

5. Predation has become a major cause of financial losses in the livestock and game ranching industries in South Africa. These losses are well in excess of R1 billion per annum.

6. The rate of predation is increasing due to a series of contributing factors, with an associated increase in the financial impact on these industries as well as on food security.

7. The industries affected by this problem do not exist and function in a vacuum, and it has become clear that all strategies and actions to address the problem require testing against the rule of law in South Africa, also recognizing the common law principle of the right of individuals to protect livelihoods and assets such as livestock and game.

8. There is an increasing need to ensure that strategies developed to address the problem and strategies for the management of predation must be underpinned by sound, verifiable and testable science, performed by recognized R&D practitioners whose work must stand up to peer review.

9. The fast developing nature of consumerism is such that there is a need to ensure that the overall strategies and activities of the PMF, in terms of issues such as animal welfare, are reflected in appropriately drafted and implemented Codes of Best Practice for the various sectors affected by this problem.

10. Your institution has been identified as a potential role player and contributor towards addressing this key threat to livestock production and food security.

11. This is based on your institution's standing and track record in the national and international research fraternity.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

12. You are therefore invited to attend the first meeting of the envisaged Scientific Committee on Predation Research that will subsequently advise the PMF on the way forward for Predation Research. ***Included, please see list of participants.***

13. This meeting is scheduled for ***Thursday, 24 February 2011*** *in Pretoria – a suitable venue is to be confirmed in the new year).*

14. The Terms of Reference for this committee are set as follows:

a. To establish an effective structure for predation research where available funds and expertise could be managed and coordinated.
b. Evaluate the current situation re predation in South Africa (what are our losses, literature study etc.).
c. Make proposals to the PMF re research on DCA.
d. Make proposals to the PMF re training in DCA.
e. Evaluate where funds are available for conducting research on DCA.
f. Evaluate where funding can be sought for training in DCA.
g. Propose a long term strategy to be followed in South Africa to reduce the impact of DCA.
h. Propose to the PMF who is to do the research, evaluations and training etc.

15. Besides tertiary institutions, the Committee will also involve senior representatives from the respective livestock commodity groups, Agricultural Research Council (ARC), Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, Department of Environment Affairs, Onderstepoort Veterinary Faculty, Livestock Welfare Coordinating Committee (LWCC) and the National Agricultural Marketing Council (ARC).

16. You are therefore requested to indicate your interest to participate in this process by ***14 January 2011*** *to Ms. Bonita Francis, email address: nwga@nwga.co.za.*

17. Enquiries could be addressed to Mr. Petrus de Wet, Chairman of PMF.

18. Your positive consideration will be highly appreciated."

2011

The meeting of the Steering Committee of the Predation Management Forum (PMF) was held on Thursday 24 February 2011 at the Delpen Building, Riviera, Pretoria. Excerpts of the draft minutes are quoted below:

"Attendance: Petrus de Wet (NWGA/Chairman), Thys Delport (NWGA - made a presentation to PMF), Coligny Stegmann (SA Mohair Growers' Association), Lardus van Zyl (RPO, Large Stock Industry), Jacques Malan (Wildlife Ranching SA) and Bonita Francis (Secretariat).

1 OPENING AND WELCOME

Mr. Petrus de Wet welcomed all present.

2 APOLOGIES (Attended the SAC meeting held simultaneously with PMF)

Leon de Beer (NWGA General Manager), Gerhard Grobler (SA Mohair Growers' Association), Gerhard Schutte (RPO (Small Stock Industry), Reinhardt Holtzhausen (Wildlife Ranching SA), Keith Ramsay (Nat. Dept. Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, DAFF) and HO de Waal (ALPRU).

3 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

3.1 Meeting of Steering Committee – 13 October 2010

The minutes of the 3rd meeting of the Steering Committee, held on 13 October 2010 at the NWGA Head Office, Newton Park, Port Elizabeth was accepted, subject to the following amendments on the proposal of Lardus van Zyl and seconded by Mr. Coligny Stegmann:

Version 5.0 – HO de Waal – Version 5.0

Pg. 3 – Point 4.1.1 – ***Proposal for Scientific Assessment***

Decision no. 2 was amended to read: (1) The Steering Committee in principle accepts the structure and accepts that the first two levels of the organogram are in place; and (2) The Steering Committee decided that should the Scientific Research Committee recommend that a CRC be put in place, that it be put out on tender.

3.2 Line Conference – 6 December 2010

Extract of email correspondence from Petrus de Wet to PMF Steering Committee members sent on 28 November 2010, was read and accepted as the decision by the PMF Steering Committee.

2.1 "Top of the structure is the PMF steering committee (as per our constitution), all decisions, research proposals, funding proposals and general policy and direction will emanate from this quartile meeting. No change from the status quo.

a) As decided by PMF in April 2010 a scientific committee is established and the second level. This Scientific committee will act as a blend, SC and CRC and take up the following responsibilities: (a) Evaluate the current situation re predation in ZA. (What are our losses, literature study etc.), (b) Make proposals to the PMF re research on DCA; (c) Make proposals to the PMF re training in DCA; (d) Evaluate where funds are available for conducting research on DCA; (e) Evaluate where funding can be sought for training in DCA; (f) Propose a long term strategy to be followed in ZA to reduce the impact of DCA; (g) Propose to the PMF who is to do the research, evaluations, training etc.; and (h) We as PMF can add to the list as we progress. The above are critical shortfalls in our situation currently and the cornerstones of the committees work.

We can discuss on Monday 6 December on the line conference who is to draft the terms of reference for this committee.

<u>Who is to serve on this committee?</u>

We invite in the chair of all the institutions in ZA who are actively involved in DCA environmental research. (1) Dr Nico Avenant, Chairman for the first meeting, Researcher Bloem Zoo and experience in project management; (2) US, Prof Jan Nel; (3) NMMU , Prof Graham Kerley; (4) Rhodes Univ. Prof – Dr. Dan Parker; (5) ALPRU, Prof H O de Waal; (6) UP, Prof Mike Summers; (7) SSHAB, Prof Gareth Bath; (8) Director General DoA; (9) Director General DoE; and (10) CEO of ARC – Andre Jooste.

This committee co-opt the CEO of RPO, NWGA, SAMGA and WRSA.

This committee can co-opt a scientist from the green lobbyists if they deem it important (as per our April decision).

This committee appoint their own secretariat from within their own ranks. We keep them at arms-length from NWGA."

4. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

<u>Grootfontein ADI as Centre for Predation Research</u>

Mr. Keith Ramsay was not present to report on the matter. The Chairman's discussion with him however, revealed a promise to circulate the draft proposal to the Minister.

Mr. Jacques Malan referred to an appointment with the MEC for Polokwane whereby they discussed the issue of declaring DCA as a disaster status, which is an ongoing problem and not a once-off as with other disasters.

<u>Decisions</u>: (1) To send reminders to Mr. Ramsay for the circulation of the draft; (2) Mr. Jacques Malan to follow up discussion with MEC and involve Mr. Petrus de Wet in the meeting; and (3) To further request Mr. Keith Ramsay to provide a written document on request to Minister for job creation (placing of microchips on gin traps for monitoring, for example is not a viable method for job creation.). It is the feeling of the meeting that other methods are deemed more important if job creation is a priority for Government. As per the presentation by Mr. Petrus de Wet.

Version 5.0 - H O de Waal - Version 5.0

5. MATTERS FOR DISCUSSION

5.1 Western Cape presentation by Mr. Thys Delport

Mr. Thys Delport presented a presentation highlighting helicopter hunting as a control method in six areas of the Karoo. The aim of the project is to gather data and serve as benchmark project. Mr. Delport seeks direction for the project, as he does not want to proceed outside the national boundaries.

Mr. Jacques Malan expressed disappointment that the Wildlife industry was excluded from the process. They also had similar problems, but have sorted it out with the Norms and Standard. They have achieved such success, that they are awarding Cape Nature with an award.

Decision: (1) To lobby top officials of Cape Nature to influence Dr. Kas Hamman; (2) Mr. Thys Delport to invite MEC and departmental head to problem animal meeting; (3) Invite PMF members to problem animal meeting; and (4) PMF Steering Committee to lobby provincial DG's and MEC's of provincial department of agriculture and environment about the issue.

5.2 Court-case Rob Harrison White

The meeting took note of the sequence of events as contained in the Agenda. The Chairman received advice to file for a default judgment against RHW considering that a year has passed and he has not applied for a court date.

Decision: (1) As per the advice of Joubert Galpin & Searle, to take a passive approach; (2) Gather legal opinions from senior advocates within own ranks (as per Jacques Malan, the name of Jurie Wessels); and (3) To come back to PMF to determine further proceedings.

5.3 TOPS workshop – 4 March 2011

The regulations as proposed to be discussed at TOPS workshop were not discussed. The Department requested 2 representatives per industry and it is the opinion of the Chairman that a strong contingency of delegates need to be present. He also requested Magdel Boshoff to add 3 items to the agenda, namely M44, Snares (strike) and Denning.

5.4 Northern Cape request to make pp to MEC Agriculture and MEC Environment

Mr. Petrus de Wet seeks permission from Steering Committee to make a presentation to MEC's Agriculture and Environment in the Northern Cape. This follows a request from Mr. Nico Laubscher, NC Environmental Affairs during the most recent NC NWGA Congress.

Decision: (1) Permission granted; and (2) Mr. Wian van der Linde, Chairman of NC Wildlife Ranching to be invited to accompany Mr. Petrus de Wet. He is unaware of the extent of the problem in the NC.

5.5 Progress: Norms and Standards

According to Thomas Mbedzi from Environmental Affairs, approximately 1 600 responses were received.

Mr. Jacques Malan said it was of critical importance, for the sake of the South African commercial industry, that PMF remains part of the process and especially the processing of the final document.

Decision: (1) Write a letter to Thomas Mbedzi and insist, considering that we are one of the largest stakeholders, be part of the process and especially the processing of the final document.

Version 5.0 - PD de Wet - Version 5.0

5.6 Progress: Declare DCA a disaster in SA

Already discussed under Point 3.

5.7 Research projects

5.7.1 Johan Strydom, Fox Buster & "Silent Killer"

Fox Buster

Mr. Coligny Stegmann reported that the fox buster is not a legal tool, therefore research will have to be done, where after legislation will have to approve the device. The fox buster is the equivalent to the M44 which is used extensively in America. He questions why a SA product needs to be developed if you can investigate importing the M44.

Decision: (1) To encourage Mr. Johan Strydom to legalise the Fox Buster. The PMF cannot assist financially, but we can assist by way of motivation etc.; (2) As soon as the fox buster has been legalised, then the grand scheme can be investigated; (3) Pressurise the Dept. Environmental Affairs to legalise M44 and snares in SA (those are only 2 excluded from the tool box of control methods); and (4) Usage of 1080 or alternative poison (cyanide used with M44).

5.8 Dave Pepler & Lulu Johnsons' comments in Parliament – 15 February 2011

Mr. Petrus de Wet felt confident about the approach and lobby process with the Portfolio Committee.

The Chairman referred to the interview between RSG and Mr. Dave Pepler and his very popular approach to the subject. It is the feeling of the Chairman to utilise him as a spokesperson should the need arises. The meeting agreed with the viewpoint.

5.9 Funding

5.9.1 PMF funding (state of affairs)

The Chairman reported that the PMF fund is overspent by R5 000. He requested that each industry transfer another R10 000 to cover expenses related to PMF.

(1) Each industry is prepared to give another R5 000 with the provision to increase the contribution in the future. Mrs. Patti Myburgh to invoice the industries.

(2) Each industry is responsible for the payment of his representative on the Steering Committee.

(3) Where Mr. Petrus de Wet represents the PMF on forums, the PMF fund is utilised.

5.9.2 Financing of Scientific Research Committee

The meeting takes cognisance of the fact that a small committee will be appointed, which will have a cost implication.

5.9.3 Joseph Steyn – Exhibition "Good Food and Wine" show

The meeting discussed the merits of paying for exhibition site at the Good Food and Wine show in Cape Town. The cost is R12 600 + VAT.

Decision: (1) R10 000 will be allocated from PMF and the rest from the Western Cape NWGA towards the "Mutilated sheep" exhibition stall; and (2) To request Joseph Steyn to report back about the initiative.

5.9.4 Coordinated predation management system

Mr. Coligny Stegmann expressed the need for a coordinated predation management system, to possibly reside at Grootfontein. This is also in conjunction with the project proposal of Mr. Johan Strydom whereby there is a control centre receiving and regulating information from producers and hunters on a daily basis. He refers to the Canis caracal programme which was meant to be implemented many years ago, but nothing has been done. TO SEE THE DIRECTION OF THE SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH COMMITTEE.'

Version 5.0 - Hoole Waal - Version 5.0

Pursuant to the broad invitation extended on 10 November 2010, individuals were invited by the Predation Management Forum (PMF) to serve as the Scientific Advisory Committee (SAC), to be convened at the first meeting on Thursday 24 February 2011 in Pretoria. The SAC meeting and the PMF Steering Committee convened simultaneous in separate boardrooms. After much post-meeting deliberations by e-mail, a draft "*Discussion Document: First meeting of the Scientific Advisory Committee (SAC), Predation Management Forum (PMF), Pretoria, 24 February 2011*" emerged as quoted below:

"*Present: (SAC) Dr. Nico Avenant, Mammalogy Department, National Museum, Bloemfontein (NMB) - Chair; Prof. Jan Nel, Dept. Botany & Zoology, Stellenbosch University; Dr. Dan Parker, Dept. Zoology & Entomology: Wildlife & Reserve Management Research Group, Rhodes University; Prof. Graham Kerley, Dept. Zoology: Centre for African Conservation Ecology, Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University (NMMU); Prof. HO de Waal, African Large Predator Research Unit (ALPRU) and Dept. Animal, Wildlife and Grassland Sciences, University of the Free State; Prof. Gareth Bath, Livestock and Welfare Coordinating Committee (LWCC); Prof. Andre Jooste, National Agricultural Marketing Council: Market and Economic Research Centre; Magdel Boshoff, Dept. Environmental Affairs, Directorate Regulation & Monitoring Services: Policy Development; Thomas Mbedzi, Dept. Environmental Affairs; Leon de Beer, National Woolgrowers' Association of SA; Gerhard Schutte, Red Meat Producers' Organisation; Gerhard Grobler, SA Mohair Growers' Association; Reinhardt Holtzhausen, Wildlife Ranching SA; and Jacques Malan, Wildlife Ranching SA. Apologies: Prof. Michael Somers, Centre for Wildlife Management, University of Pretoria; Lourens Swanepoel, Centre for Wildlife Management, University of Pretoria; Langa Zita, Dept. Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries. Invited - no response: Dr. Shadrack Mpuli, Agricultural Research Council.*

The meeting started with six members of the PMF [Lardus van Zyl, Thys Delport, Keith Ramsay, Bonita Francis (Secretary), Coligny Stegmann and Petrus de Wet (Chair PMF)] also present. The Chair of the PMF, Mr. Petrus de Wet, explained the rational why the SAC was called into being by the PMF. He discussed the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the SAC, as suggested by the PMF. The meeting is requested to debate the ToR, the SAC structure and workplan. Mr. de Wet handed over to Dr. Avenant for the first meeting of the SAC. The PMF members (listed above) left to conduct a PMF executive meeting, while the SAC meeting continued.

Points on the Agenda (drafted provisionally by the Chair of the first SAC meeting and the Chair of the PMF; more points were invited at the start of the meeting, or may be added as the meeting progressed):

1. The challenge: an introduction, presentation and discussion
– current knowledge on the distribution and extent of losses;
– knowledge base and inventory of research conducted and published.
2. Research plan: identifying the scope, disciplines, time frames, role players, opportunities for collaboration, ethics, etc.
3. Terms of Reference (ToR) of the SAC.
4. Effective structure and work plan: how will the SAC link with the PMF? The timing, submission and format of proposals and published reports.
5. Composition of the SAC.
6. Funding: prioritization, role and needs of the SAC, and opportunities.

Points of the Agenda discussed:

5.9.4.1 Dr. Avenant started with a brief introduction regarding current knowledge on the distribution and extent of losses due to black-backed jackal and caracal (the most important damage-causing predators) in Southern Africa. He also discussed the knowledge base and referred to an inventory of research conducted and published. He

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 1.0

also stressed that information on both topics is limited. Available records suggest that the financial losses suffered by individual farmers, members of producer organisations and South Africa is substantial and that these losses have increased over the last 15 years. Indications are that losses due to these two predators occur throughout the country, but vary between provinces and districts.

Dr. Avenant pointed out that information about the ecology of black-backed jackal and caracal is lacking and insufficient to form the basis of a predation management plan.

The following individuals are currently known to conduct research on human-carnivore conflict mitigation in South Africa: Dan Parker (Rhodes University); Deon Cilliers (EWT Carnivore Conflict Group); Quinton Martins (Cape Leopard Trust); Rob Harrison-White (Wildlife Damage Research and Management); Bool Smuts (Landmark Foundation); Mark Keith (WITS); Guy Balme (Pantheras Lion Conservation Program for East and Southern Africa); Graham Kerley (Dept. Zoology, NMMU), Nico Avenant (National Museum, Bloemfontein); Jurie du Plessis (National Museum and Centre for Environmental Management, UFS); Francois Deacon (Dept. Geography, UFS); HO de Waal (ALPRU, UFS), Quinette Saffy (ALPRU, UFS); Andries Strauss (ALPRU, UFS); Walter van Niekerk (ALPRU/Agricultural Economics, UFS).

5.9.4.2 The Meeting acknowledged that although the challenges present excellent opportunities for collaboration, the complexity of the challenge necessitates a coordinated, trans-disciplinary, collaboration approach and role players (specialists) from a wide range of disciplines should be included in the research and discussions. The synergy, fund-raising and efficient channelling of resources related to a cooperative research programme were discussed and a decision taken to revisit such an initiative at a later stage. Disciplines that could contribute to achieve the long term goal are: Economy; Biodiversity; Ecology; Ethology; Pathology; Social; Management; Environmental law; Ethics; Animal welfare; Public relations.

It was agreed that time frames should be set: the need to have short and medium term goals in order to reach the PMFs long term goal "to reduce the impact of damage causing animals" was expressed.

It was realised that all role players involved in the research and dissemination of results should adhere to a strict professional code of conduct. The word ethical was also proposed but this was not debated further.

5.9.4.3 The ToR as proposed by the PMF (in italics, below), was debated and the comments of the SAC are underlined:

To establish an effective structure for predation research – <u>The SAC can emphasize the need for such a structure and advise on how it should look/function, but it is not our function to establish it</u>;

<u>Evaluate the current situation re predation in South Africa (losses, assessment, current state of research, policy, DEWA, DAFF)</u> – <u>collate was proposed as a more appropriate operative than evaluate; also the SAC can advise on who can do this work and how it should be done, but it is not our function to evaluate or collate the current situation;</u>

Make proposals to the PMF re research on DCA – <u>as an "advisory" committee the SAC agree to</u> <u>make recommendations on proposals submitted</u>;

Make proposals to the PMF re training in DCA – <u>as an "advisory" committee the SAC agree to</u> <u>make recommendations on proposals submitted</u>;

Evaluate where funds are available for conducting research on DCA – <u>not the function of the SAC; as an "advisory" committee we agree to make recommendations;</u>

Propose to the PMF who is to do the research, evaluations and training etc. – <u>as an "advisory" committee the SAC agree to make recommendations on proposals submitted;</u>

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

e.g. projects should go out on tender - we will evaluate the proposals and offer recommendations to the PMF;

Propose a long-term strategy to be followed in South Africa to reduce the impact of DCA – This is an implementation/management objective: as an Advisory Committee that focuses on research we will contribute towards such a strategy. Also, we will focus on predation issues and not all damage-causing animals. This process already starts with no.7, below.

Following on the discussions above, the SAC proposes the following Terms of Reference:

A. To evaluate the scientific merit and feasibility of submissions received from the PMF and report back on these proposals for research and development.

B. Evaluate and advise the PMF on other specific requests received from the PMF.

*5.9.4.4 The SAC will operate at arms length from the PMF. It was proposed the SAC will function as a **S**cientific, **A**dvisory, **C**ommittee (as the name suggests), and not as a Scientific Research Committee (SRC) as was proposed by the PMF.*

The SAC will respond to proposals submitted to the PMF. These proposals should be provided in a standard format to the PMF and submitted to the secretariat of the SAC and then to its chair. The secretariat of the SAC will distribute proposals electronically to members for discussion. Discussions will be conducted in two phases: (i) the core group will discuss the issues electronically and (ii) then distribute it via the Secretariat to all SAC members for the final decision. Fourteen (14) days after the start of phase (ii) and after the comments have been considered, the core group will take a final decision.

The SAC report with recommendations will be submitted electronically to the Secretariat of the PMF.

It should be noted that no formal submission has been forwarded by the PMF to the SAC yet.

The SAC realised that it is important to meet in person at least once per year: no final decision was taken on this matter as it could be premature. The SAC agreed that a decision will be taken once it is clear how the proposed process plays out/develops. This applies specifically to the question about who will bear the costs of travel and accommodation when meetings become more frequent.

6. It was agreed that people from more entities could be invited. SAC members are invited to propose suggestions. The core group will discuss this with the PMF. The final invitation to new invitees will be sent out by the Secretariat. A decision was taken that Prof. Michael Somers will be invited to join the core group.

***The SAC is composed as follows: Chair**: Nico Avenant; **Secretariat**: Dr. Shirley Parker-Nance, Centre for African Conservation Ecology, Administrator and PA to the Director: ACE, Department of Zoology, P O Box 77000, Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University, Port Elizabeth 6031 - Shirley.Parker-Nance@nmmu.ac.za; **Core group**: Nico Avenant, Graham Kerley, HO de Waal, Leon de Beer, Michael Somers; **SAC**: all 14 members present at the first meeting + more can be invited/co-opted.*

It was also suggested that the SAC should remain lean and flexible with the option to co-opt specific expertise on a case by case basis.

7. Due to time constraints and the fact that most matters/points have been covered, point 6 (Funding: prioritization, role and needs of the SAC, and opportunities) was not revisited. Conclusions drawn from discussions earlier in the meeting are summarised as follows:

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

The expanse of the task necessitates that the issues and projects identified should be prioritized within the short, medium and long term goals (to be addressed in 7, below). As funding (and other resources) is expected to be limited, the prioritizing process should be well managed.

Funds will have to be sourced for:

- *the SAC will make recommendations for specific proposals as may be required by the PMF;*
- *in some instances individual researchers may find funding for specific projects, but the sourcing of funding is not the SAC's responsibility;*
- *it is suggested that the two Government departments (Environment and Agriculture), as well as the producers' organisations realise their responsibility, become involved and budget specifically with the SAC's suggestions (see no 7, below) in mind.*

The PMF should take note that members of the SAC does not get paid to be involved with the SAC, nor is it their function or a requirement from their employers, or does their employers cover their costs to be involved (e.g. to attend SAC meetings). These activities must be budgeted for and the funding found, often from other external sources. The members that have agreed to become involved in the SAC do so because they want to make a useful contribution to solving the problem through their own and collaborative research. In many cases, this is in addition to their existing work load and it is therefore crucial that the SAC operates time efficiently and effectively.

A verbal ***report back*** *was provided to the PMF Executive when they re-joined the meeting. At the end of the report-back the SAC agreed to come back to the PMF with the following:*

a. ***Goal:*** *Reduce livestock losses caused by predation to an acceptable level using methods that are practical, sustainable and economical. The SAC endorses an approach which is scientifically based, biologically sound, environmentally safe and socially responsible.*

b. ***List of long and short term issues*** *that are important to start with. The core group will include these items in the table on the next page.*

Short term goals:

1. *Initiate a process for a scientific assessment to be carried out [although the assessment may take 18-24 months before a report is submitted (to do the assessment therefore listed as a "medium term goal"), it is important to get the process rolling as soon as possible].*
2. *Initiate a process to establish a coordinated predation management system in South Africa (as above). Although it is listed here, this is not a function of the SAC.*
3. *Launch a comprehensive information dissemination programme (to gain public acceptance).*
4. *Determine the demography (distribution and density) of black-backed jackal and caracal in the different areas/regions [e.g. in specific areas/habitats, under specific management variables, in relation to specific losses; to inform the launching of more dedicated and appropriate research projects; also important to put no. 3 (below) in perspective].*
5. *A survey of management practises and methods in specific areas (e.g. in terms of reduced losses, impact on the population dynamics of both predators and their natural prey). Collate, with a view to incorporate it in Best Management Practices (BMP) for immediate implementation. A high priority with rapid feedback to farmers essential.*
6. *A follow-up study on livestock losses was initiated by ALPRU to collect more data for farms in areas identified during the recent study of Van Niekerk 2010.*

Medium term goals *(some follow from the short term goals)****:***

1. *A scientific assessment.*

Version 5.0 – HG de Waal – Version 5.0

2. Establish a coordinated predation management system in South Africa.
3. Determine the impact of specific management efforts (on individuals, populations, relationship between black-backed jackal and caracal, ecosystems/biodiversity, etc.).
4. Determine the costs of specific management efforts.
5. Improve our understanding of the ecology (inter alia diet, reproduction, behaviour and social structure) of black-backed jackal and caracal.
6. Determine what affects the problem/losses (historical, past 5-10 years, specific seasons, specific farming practises).
7. Address the legal and ethical aspects relating to predation management.
8. Address the social issues relating to losses and predation management.

***c. Standard format for proposals** (see separate attachment, PMF Proforma.doc)"*

On 24 March 2011, Prof. HO de Waal gave a presentation[836] on the Canis-Caracal Programme and predation management to the De Aar Agri Union, De Aar, Northern Cape Province.

The 5th meeting of the Steering Committee of the Predation Management Forum (PMF) was held on Wednesday 20 April 2011 at Farmers Folly Guest House, Lynnwood, Pretoria. Excerpts of the minutes are quoted below:

"*Attendance: Petrus de Wet (NWGA/Chairman), Gerhard Grobler (SA Mohair Growers' Association), Coligny Stegmann (SA Mohair Growers' Association) Lardus van Zyl (RPO, Large Stock Industry), Gerhard Schutte (RPO, Small Stock Industry), Jaco Rossouw (Wildlife Ranching SA), Keith Ramsay (Dept. of Agriculture) and Bonita Francis (Secretariat). Scientific Advisory Committee (SAC): Nico Avenant (National Museum (Convenor), Graham Kerley (NMMU), Leon de Beer (NWGA), HO de Waal (University of Free State) and Mike Somers (University of Pretoria). Apologies: Magdel Boshoff (Dept. Environment); and Jacques Malan (Wildlife Ranching SA).*

1. OPENING AND WELCOME

Prof. HO de Waal opened the meeting with prayer. The Chairman, Mr. Petrus de Wet welcomed everyone present, with specific reference to Mr. Jaco Rossouw from Wildlife Ranchers SA.

3 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The Minutes of the previous meeting, which were held on 24 February 2011 at the Delpen Building, Pretoria were approved with no changes on the proposal of Mr. Coligny Stegmann. It could not be seconded because nobody further was present at the meeting.

4 MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

4.1 TOPS Workshop (4 March 2011)

For cognisance. Comments regarding the listing of species were sent to the Dept. of Environmental Affairs and they were also supplied with a name list of stakeholders who they should involve with the process to amend the species list and regulations.

4.1.1 Nominations for representatives at Species Listing Workshop

[836] De Waal, HO, 2011. Coordinated predation management system in South Africa – lessons to be learnt. Interacting with the USDA-APHIS Wildlife Services and other role players in Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Arizona and Texas from 17-28 May 2010. De Aar Agri Unie. 24 Maart 2011. Buiteklub, De Aar, Noordkaap Provinsie, Suid-Afrika.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal, Version 5.0

Bonita Francis will coordinate the names to be sent to the Dept. Environment Affairs for attending the next Species Listing Workshop: PMF representative - Petrus de Wet, Industries (4 X representatives), HO de Waal and Nico Avenant.

4.2 Progress – Norms and Standards

The Chairman reported that a letter was sent to DEWA requesting that the PMF remain involved in the process. Further to that, no new progress.

Prof. HO De Waal informed the meeting that an official of DEWA were making enquiries about the American study tour and that he and Magdel Boshoff will rephrase the questions in order to get a draft on the table for discussion as soon as possible.

Decision: Request Mr. Jacques Malan to write a 1-page report on most recent meeting he attended.

Action: Jaco Rossouw.

4.3 "Good Food and Wine" Exhibition

For cognisance.

4.4 Intervention necessary in the Western Cape

Mr. Coligny Stegmann expressed concern over the role that Dr. Bool Smuts is playing in the Western Cape and he feels that PMF needs to be more involved in the province. He proposed that a letter be written to Charl Opperman, Agri Western Cape informing them of the objectives of PMF.

Decision: Representatives Thys Delport (NWGA) and John Durr (RPO) is part of Agri Western Cape Problem Animal Forum.

The Chairman undertook to discuss the matter with the relevant persons, including Mr. Jacques Malan (as per minutes of previous meeting).

4.5 DCA as disaster declaration

Mr. Keith Ramsay reported that he made a submission. The Chairman requested Mr. Ramsay to provide the correct wording and phrases, where after the PMF will forward the request.

***Decision**: Mr. Keith Ramsay to draft a letter on the weekend.*

5 MATTERS FOR DISCUSSION

5.1 Report back from Scientific Advisory Committee (SAC)

Dr. Nico Avenant, convenor of the grouping reported that an additional member, Prof. Mike Somers from the Pretoria University joined the SAC. The discussion document on the table is basically the minutes of the 1st meeting which were held on 24 February 2011 in Pretoria.

5.1.1 Composition of SAC Steering Committee

It was a proposal from SAC to establish a smaller committee, consisting of the following persons: (1) Nico Avenant, National Museum; (2) Leon de Beer, NWGA; (3) Graham Kerley, NMMU; (4) HO de Waal, University of Free State; and (5) Mike Somers, University of Pretoria.

The Secretariat is based at the NMMU – Dr. Shirley Parker Nance.

The Steering Committee expressed the need to include representatives from industry research committees on SAC to eliminate a breakdown in communication. These representatives/committees are influential to industry research trusts and the process of recommendations will thus be streamlined.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

Mr. Leon de Beer said that research committees do not have the expertise to make recommendations and decisions and by including them in SAC, the process will be more transparent. In order to access funds from Government, PMF needs to register as a commodity, whereas the industry trusts are already legal entities.

Mr. Coligny Stegmann proposed that a representative of PMF serve on SAC.

Discussion:

Mr. Petrus de Wet explained how the structure in the wool industry works, and he foresees a problem in that a representative of Cape Wools SA will serve on the committee, thereby side lining the industry (they will not be in a position to determine the real priorities for research – it should be on producer level).

Mr. Coligny Stegmann said that a similar trend will follow in the Mohair industry.

Mr. Gerhard Schutte explained how the structure within the Red Meat Industry works and feels that there is merit in the request and they welcome the invitation that a representative from the RMRDT serve on the committee. That is exactly how the structure should work.

Prof. Graham Kerley explained: (1) SAC is simply an advisory committee to PMF; (2) PMF relies on the integrity and ability of SAC to justify the way forward; (3) By including the research trusts, you will increase transparency, reduce replication, process will be far more efficient and you will increase the value of the Advisory Committee; and (4) To bear in mind that the PMF has no money. There is a whole range of other organisations also putting money into research.

Decision: (1) SAC to make recommendation to PMF for co-optation of representatives from industry research trusts. This will be solely based for transparency and communication purposes; (2) Research recommendations will still be made to PMF and channelled to various research trusts for implementation; and (3) PMF will identify a representative within each industry research committee to serve as co-opted members on SAC. There should be a clear understanding that those being co-opted, still abide by the existing structures.

5.1.2 Terms of Reference

The Terms of Reference as proposed by PMF were discussed and the following were identified to NOT be the functions of SAC: (1) To establish an effective structure for predation research. SAC can emphasise the need for such a structure and advise on how it should look. ***Petrus said we have now taken care of it?****; (2) Evaluate the current situation re predation in SA (losses, assessment, current state of research, policy, DEWA, DAFF). SAC can advise on who can do this work and how it should be done; and (3) Evaluate where funds are available for conducting research on DCA. SAC can agree to make recommendations.*

PMF accepted the following Terms of Reference for SAC: (1) To evaluate the scientific merit and feasibility of submissions received from PMF and report back on these proposals for research and development; and (2) Evaluate and advise the PMF on other specific requests received from PMF.

Practical procedure: Four proposals for research projects as received by PMF will be discussed and given to SAC to form part of the Scientific Assessment. Proposals to be submitted on the allocated proforma.

5.1.3 Scientific Assessment

Dr. Nico Avenant said that it is one of the short term goals of SAC to initiate a process for a scientific assessment and it is critical that it commence as soon as possible. The results will determine where predation research is lacking; political backing; address conflicting interpretations of greenies etc. (group's view of an issue).

Version 5.0 - MD de Waal - Version 2.0

Mr. Petrus de Wet referred to promising discussions and meetings with DEWA and DAFF where they accepted that predation management is a function of Government and in principle supported that a Scientific Assessment for Stock Predation in SA be done. DAFF even allocated an official to drive the process. However, nothing has been formally documented – just verbal agreements.

Prof. Graham Kerley explained that the key step forward is that the PMF express their commitment and the Ministers of DAFF and DEWA get the backing. There is already a lot of excitement on department level. The Scientific Assessment is just a tool to make their job easier. He also predicts a long term legitimacy from the Departments in term of funding. To now find a mechanism to get the process moving.

Decision: (1) Draft letter to the DG and DDG for DAFF whereby support by PMF for a Scientific Assessment is expressed. This should be followed up with the necessary documents and meetings. A TIME FRAME NEED TO BE ALLOCATED TO THE PROCESS. Should this fail, to go and see the Minister.

Action: Leon de Beer in collaboration with Graham Kerley; (2) No need to re-send the Scientific Assessment proposal, because it has already been circulated and funding earmarked for it; and (3) Prof. Graham Kerley is meeting with Environmental Affairs on 11 May – to provide Prof. Kerley with letter and he will personally deliver and discuss with DDG, Mr. Fundisile Mketeni.

5.1.4 Cooperative Research Program (CRP)

Prof. Graham Kerley explained the idea behind a Cooperative Research Programme, which is critical for the way forward for the industry. There is a proposal for CRP, which is based on an Australian model. The benefit of a CRP is that the full research resources of departments are harnessed. Also has the potential to set up programmes for THRIP and European Union funding. As soon as DEAT heard of the programme, they indicated that they will free their research resources because it is a larger collaborate approach, eliminating fragmentation. It is a win-win approach. It is also a fact that Government support the funding of centres (FOCUSSED SUPPORT).

He further referred to the dwindling capacity and that many researchers have left the country – one needs a more structured approach than Grootfontein.

It is further critical to recognise that Government cannot do anything alone and that a partnership needs to be created. To put something on the table to start with.

Mr. Petrus de Wet said that Cape Wools SA is very specific with regards to funding of research programmes.

Mr. Gerhard Schutte also stated that their research projects are finely scrutinised and that no funding will go towards the payment of salaries and office space of researchers.

*Summary: (1) To compile an internal discussion document and circulate between PMF and SAC; (2) Each industry needs to determine what they can allocate towards a CRP; (3) Dr. Nico Avenant asked if the SAC must draft a motivation for a CRP; (4) The chairman answered that two aspects are coming to the fore, namely: (a) How will the CRP look – **industries must draft an internal discussion document;** and (b) How will the "coordinated management system look – **Prof. HO de Waal must draft this programme**; and (5) The Western Cape Minister provided money for research – it is meaningless to spend R500 000 in the Western Cape – it must be negotiated to have the money allocated for the national programme.*

Decision: (1) Regarding the CRP: the industries must draft an internal discussion document and circulate it to the PMF and SAC; and (2) Regarding the COORDINATED MANAGEMENT SYSTEM: Prof. HO de Waal must provide a proposal and circulate it to the PMF and SAC; and (3) The funding for the programme will only be determined later – attend firstly to the discussion document.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

5.1.5 Coordinated Research Management

Prof. HO de Waal referred to an umbrella management programme (which is a state function), but such a structure was absent in South Africa. In principle this is a good system but where and how is it going to be funded. Perhaps it must be part of Coordinated Research Management which must be funded by the state.

Mr. Coligny Stegmann referred to a draft resolution for discussion at a forthcoming congress which will request the Dept. of Agriculture to establish a system of coordinated predation management at Grootfontein. The government must be the face of predation management – it is their function.

Decision: As previously (see 5.1.4).

5.1.6 Prioritising of projects

Dr. Nico Avenant reported on short and medium term goals which has been identified by SAC, of which the Scientific Assessment and coordinated predation management system has been listed. However, due to the many disciplines associated with the goals and SAC not having all those disciplines to their disposal, it will have to be circulated to a wider spectrum of people.

Prof. Graham Kerley requested that it be formally minuted that SAC withdraw this part of the minutes/discussion document because there was some confusion over the process, which could pose a very real risk for PMF of not being best informed. There are many disciplines involved in the various projects and it was decided (prior to the meeting) that SAC canvass far more stakeholders in order to determine priorities.

Decision: (1) The point was withdrawn; (2) As per the decision at the February 2011 meeting, SAC needs to co-op whoever they deem necessary for the task at hand; and (3) SAC needs more time in order to determine short and medium goals and they can provide feed back when ready.

5.1.7 Funding of SAC

Dr. Nico Avenant enquired about expenses associated with the function of SAC.

Decision: (1) SAC to provide PMF with a business plan detailing proposed meetings and expenses; and (2) Expenses prior to the business plan will be covered by PMF.

5.2 Media Campaign

- *Dave Pepler*

Mr. Petrus de Wet informed the meeting that Mr. Dave Pepler is requesting money for his services. It is his opinion that Mr. Pepler be involved in future interviews by media companies such as Carte Blanch, Fokus, etc.

- *Mohair SA*

Mr. Petrus de Wet informed the meeting of an opportunity to use a media company provided by Mohair SA, to portray the farmers' story to the general public. There will be no costs involved. To possibly utilise Mr. Dave Pepler in this regard.

Mr. Gerhard Grobler will take the offer up with the Chairman of Mohair SA and discuss their commitment.

Decision: (1) Discuss the matter with Mohair SA and involve the Media company in determining if it will be effective or counter reactive; and (2) Media company to make presentation at the next PMF meeting, with the provision that Mohair SA will stand in for the costs.

5.3 DCA Courses

For cognisance. The Chairman said that many problem animal courses are conducted by various people, including Neil Viljoen, Thys de Wet as well as unqualified persons,

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

which are creating problems. Some of these courses are not subjected to standards and legislation.

Should a coordinated management system be in place, it will eliminate the above, because legislation will be determined in partnership with other stakeholders.

Mr. Leon de Beer mentioned that Agri SETA has a unit standard for training and he will try to get a course accredited.

In the meantime the course by Neil Viljoen will continue – the free market will determine whether the presenter is good.

5.4 Research Projects

5.4.1 Livestock Guarding Dog project

Mr. Gerhard Grobler gave a brief background on the project. He wonders if the requested funding should not be paid by the farmers who will be utilising the dogs.

It is also the opinion of Mr. Leon de Beer that the success of various respondents with Anatolian guard dogs varies to such an extent that one should rather look at the evaluation of all the methods in the tool box.

Mr. Gerhard Schutte referred to the procedure applied by the RMRDT given priority and available funds. Do not say outright no to a project – provide support to the project provided other sources must also be approached for funding.

Decision: Project request was referred to the SAC.

5.4.2 E-Sheperd Collar

Mr. Petrus de Wet provided background and said at R580-00 per collar it seems to be very expensive. The trials will be completed by mid-May 2011. Researcher must be advised to conduct trials in the Karoo and thus lower the price.

Decision: Project request was referred to the SAC.

5.4.3 Patent – toxic capsules to kill predators (Olivier Boerdery Trust, Edenburg)

Mr. Leon de Beer briefly the background. The project was rejected because poison will be used. As scientists they disassociate them from this project because of legislation. The only poison which may be used is 1080 with a permit.

Decision: The project was rejected.

5.4.4 "Silent Killer + Fox Buster"

Once developed and legal, the device can be a valuable tool to producers. Prof. HO de Waal was requested to assist Mr. Johan Strydom in his endeavours.

5.4.5 Estimating the impact of predation

Mr. Gerhard Grobler requested Prof. HO de Waal to present a project proposal to determine the impact of predation in the beef cattle industry. To further request the Wildlife Industry to propose a similar project proposal to determine the impact in the wildlife sector.

Decision: (1) Project proposal by Prof. HO de Waal to be sent to PMF Secretariat for referral to SAC for consideration; (2) WRSA to pose a similar request for the Wildlife industry; and (3) To send a copy to Mr. Keith Ramsay.

7 NEXT MEETING

The meeting decided that no Forum meeting will be held at the end of May, due to the fact that it will just be a report back meeting. This meeting will be combined with the quarterly meeting of the PMF Steering Committee, to be held in August 2011 in Bloemfontein. Bonita Francis to determine date and venue."

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

On 21 May 2011, Prof. HO de Waal gave a presentation[837] on the Canis-Caracal Programme and predation management at a WRSA Conference, Riverside Lodge, Aliwal North, Northern Cape Province.

On 25 May 2011, Prof. HO de Waal, Mr. Walter van Niekerk and Mrs. Quinette Saffy gave presentations[838],[839],[840] on the Canis-Caracal Programme and predation management at a CCP Working Session, Springbok, Northern Cape Province. Arrangements were made with participating farmers to provide information on predation losses and predation control on a regular basis to a CCP project.

On 9 June 2011, Prof. HO de Waal gave a presentation[841] on the Canis-Caracal Programme and predation management at the Free State RPO Congress, Lettie Fouché Lapa, Bloemfontein, Free State Province.

On 27 July 2011, Prof. HO de Waal, Mr. Walter van Niekerk and Mrs. Quinette Saffy gave presentations[842],[843],[844] on the Canis-Caracal Programme and predation management at a CCP Working Session, Britstown, Northern Cape Province. Arrangements were made with participating farmers to provide information on predation losses and predation control on a regular basis to a CCP project.

It later transpired that individuals, who have also attended the meeting, might have influenced farmers not to participate in the CCP project and refrain from submitting important information on a regular basis.

On 16 August 2011, Prof. HO de Waal gave a presentation[845] regarding a system of coordinated predation management to the PMF Steering Committee, NWGA Board Room, Newton Park, Port Elizabeth, Eastern Cape Province.

Report 6.6 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

[837] De Waal, HO, 2011. Coordinated predation management system in South Africa – lessons to be learnt. Interacting with the USDA-APHIS Wildlife Services and other role players in Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Arizona and Texas from 17-28 May 2010. WRSA Vrystaat Wildkonferensie. 21 May 2011. Riverside Lodge, Aliwal-Noord, Noordkaap Provinsie, Suid-Afrika.

[838] De Waal, HO, 2011. Gekoördineerde predasiebestuur in Suid-Afrika – lesse te leer. Interacting with the USDA-APHIS Wildlife Services and other role players in Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Arizona and Texas from 17-28 May 2010. CCP Werksessie te Springbok. 25 Mei 2011. NG Kerksaal, Springbok, Noordkaap Provinsie, Suid-Afrika.

[839] Van Niekerk, Walter, Taljaard, P.R., Grové, B. & De Waal, H.O., 2011. The extent of predation management in the Northern Cape Province of South Africa. CCP Werksessie te Springbok. 25 Mei 2011. NG Kerksaal, Springbok, Noordkaap Provinsie, Suid-Afrika.

[840] Saffy, Quinette, 2011. 'n Elektroniese databasis vir predasie en roofdierbestuur. CCP Werksessie te Springbok. 25 Mei 2011. NG Kerksaal, Springbok, Noordkaap Provinsie, Suid-Afrika.

[841] De Waal, HO, 2011. Gekoördineerde predasiebestuur in Suid-Afrika – lesse te leer. Interacting with the USDA-APHIS Wildlife Services and other role players in Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Arizona and Texas from 17-28 May 2010. Vrystaatse RPO Kongres - Predasiebestuur. 9 Junie 2011. Lettie Fouché, Lapa, Bloemfontein, Suid-Afrika.

[842] De Waal, HO, 2011. Gekoördineerde predasiebestuur in Suid-Afrika – lesse te leer. Interacting with the USDA-APHIS Wildlife Services and other role players in Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Arizona and Texas from 17-28 May 2010. CCP Werksessie te Britstown. 27 Julie 2011. Buiteklub, Britstown, Noordkaap Provinsie, Suid-Afrika.

[843] Van Niekerk, Walter, Taljaard, P.R., Grové, B. & De Waal, H.O., 2011. The extent of predation management in the Northern Cape Province of South Africa. CCP Werksessie te te Britstown. 27 Julie 2011. Buiteklub, Britstown, Noordkaap Provinsie, Suid-Afrika.

[844] Saffy, Quinette, 2011. 'n Elektroniese databasis vir predasie en roofdierbestuur. CCP Werksessie te te Britstown. 27 Julie 2011. Buiteklub, Britstown, Noordkaap Provinsie, Suid-Afrika.

[845] De Waal, HO, 2011. A system of coordinated predation management in South Africa – lessons learnt and a way forward. Drawing on interactions with the USDA-APHIS Wildlife Services and other role players in Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Arizona and Texas from 17-28 May 2010. PMF Steering Committee. 16 August 2011. NWGA Board Room, Newton Park, Port Elizabeth, South Africa.

The 6th Meeting of the Predation Management Forum (PMF) Steering Committee was held on Tuesday 30 August 2011 at the Monte Bello Estate near Bloemfontein. Excerpts of the minutes are quoted below:

"Attendance: Petrus de Wet (NWGA/Chairman), Johannes Klopper (NWGA Mpumalanga), Harry Prinsloo (NWGA), Leon de Beer (NWGA General Manager), Gerhard Grobler (SA Mohair Growers' Association), Coligny Stegmann (SA Mohair Growers' Association), Lardus van Zyl (RPO, Large Stock Industry), Gert Dry (Wildlife Ranching SA), HO de Waal (University of Free State), Steve Galane (Dept. of Agriculture), Victor Musetha (Dept. of Agriculture), Japie Smit (Dept. of Agriculture), Magdel Boshoff (Dept. Environmental Affairs), Thomas Mbedzi (Dept. Environmental Affairs), Nico Avenant (National Museum) and Bonita Francis (Secretariat). Apologies: Gerhard Schutte (RPO, Small Stock Industry).

1 OPENING AND WELCOME

Dr. Gert Dry opened the meeting with prayer. The Chairman, Mr. Petrus de Wet welcomed everyone present.

2 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The Minutes of the previous meeting, which were held on 20 April 2011 at Farmers Folly Guest House, Lynnwood, were approved with the following amendments on the proposal of Mr. Gerhard Grobler and seconded by Dr. Gert Dry.

Point no. 3 – Approval of Minutes "…. with no changes on the proposal of Mr. Coligny Stegmann. It could not be seconded because nobody further was present at the meeting."

Mr. Gerhard Grobler proposed that should the Chairman, Mr. Petrus de Wet and Mr. Coligny Stegmann be present at a meeting and they are confident about a specific decision, it be accepted by the meeting.

Point no. 4.4 – Page 2 – Intervention necessary in the Western Cape Mr. Coligny Stegmann expressed concern over the role that "DR BOOL SMUTS" is playing……

The Secretary to not mention names in the minutes, but rather refer to "Activist groupings".

Point 5.1.3 – Page 5 – Scientific Assessment 2. No need to re-send the Scientific Assessment proposal, because it has already been circulated and funding earmarked for it.

If DEA has earmarked it, it is not the recommendation of this meeting?

General reflection of the Minutes – Magdel Boshoff from DEA and NOT DEWA

4 MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

4.1 TOPS Species listing workshop, held 23 May 2011

The Chairman reported positively on the workshop.

Ms. Magdel Boshoff gave a brief overview of DEA's intention with the TOPS workshop and that is to move away from the TOPS list and 1 + 9 system (National & Provincial). She does not know if Jackal and Caracal will definitely be on the TOPS list (there were no support for listing those), but if you want to move away from the above mentioned system, those animals need to be added to the list.

The Chairman remarked that the Act stipulates that the TOPS list needs to be reviewed every 5 years. If Jackal and Caracal are placed on protected list with amendment and PMF can get an absolute guarantee that the exemption will be permanent, then they will be happy. It is all about trust.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal Version 5.0

Ms. Magdel Boshoff referred to the Biodiversity Act amendments and scheduled workshop – industries will be invited to these workshops and input and comments will be asked.

Mr. Johannes Klopper requested that the 2 species not be listed because as soon as you list them, it gives an impression that there is a problem.

Conclusion: This will be an on-going debate.

4.2 "Good Food and Wine" Exhibition

The meeting took cognisance of the brief report received from Joseph Steyn. It is the feeling of the chairman to support initiatives such as these, because it all contributes to creating awareness of the issue.

4.3 DCA as disaster declaration

The Chairman briefed Mr. Steve Galane, DAFF on the matter, mentioning that 2 years have passed and nothing have emanated from the promises of a DAFF official. The Forum wants it declared as disaster just like with Locusts.

Decision: Mr. Steve Galane indicated that he will address the matter.

4.4 Media campaign (arising)

Mr. Gerhard Grobler reported on discussions between Mohair SA and 2 media companies who proposed the following 2 levels: (1) Media campaign aimed at government, whereby pressure is applied in terms of their responsibilities to deliver on rural and social development, food security etc.; and (2) General awareness campaign whereby the general public is informed of the problem.

Questions from media companies will be circulated to Steering Committee for comments. It should be handled in careful and responsible manner and the companies will give some ideas.

Dr. Gert Dry said that material for websites and publications should be used to the fullest extent.

5 MATTERS FOR DISCUSSION

5.1 Scientific Assessment and funds from DAFF and DEA

Mrs. Magdel Boshoff, DEA indicated that she does not know if the proposal has gone to the DDG. However, he would require a business proposal with clear indications and objectives of what needs to be done. The formal request is only the start of the process. It is also important to know where the funding which has already been given by DEA fits into the proposal.

The Chairman remarked that the business proposal would have been forthcoming from SAC, but they have now ceased to function. The official standpoint of PMF is contained in the letter addressed to the DDG dated 6 May 2011.

Decision: (1) Formal requests have been sent to both departments. Let us wait for formal response requesting a business proposal and then proceed further; (2) Representatives from both departments to follow up the requests/earmarked funding; and (3) WAITING ON GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS.

5.2 DAFF – R140 million

Mr. Petrus de Wet briefly explained where the R140 million came from, namely a thumb-suck of total estimated losses. A briefing session was held last week with DAFF and proposals was sent to Mr. Steve Galane.

Mr. Steve Galane reported on his intensions to discuss and implement the submissions with the DG, but because of bereavement, the itinerary has changed.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

However, this coming week a meeting is planned with the DG. The good news is, after the presentation the PMF Chairman made to the Executive Committee, R140 million was flagged and the Department has put on the table in terms of research, an amount of R1 million. He looked at the letter and is in agreement with the proposals. Now after discussions with the DG, they would know where to focus.

THE PMF LOOKS FORWARD TO PROGRESS IN THIS REGARD AND WILL GIVE A RUN-DOWN TO THE FORUM MEETING THE NEXT DAY.

5.3 Cooperative Research Programme (CRP) arising

5.3.1 Coordinated predation management in SA

Prof. HO de Waal reiterated the fact that a coordinated predation system is lacking in SA and referred to the US system, which is state driven. That is the plan which needs to be considered by DAFF. He briefly referred to a workshop which will be held in October 2011. The meeting discussed the importance of government officials to attend the workshop.

5.4 SAWMA Congress, Hartenbos – S&T

The Chairman has been invited to make a presentation at the above scientific Congress. He wants clarity if the expenses should be claimed from PMF. Dr. Gert Dry indicated that it should be.

The arrangement is that should a shortfall exist within the PMF account, the industries be invoiced between R5 000 – R10 000.

5.5 WC, legal action against Cape Nature

The meeting discussed the possibility of taking Cape Nature to court for losses incurred due to their prohibitive actions. Just get some legal advice from a lawyer. Over the past years, Cape Nature is the only province who steers away from cooperation with farmers. The more pressure you place, the quicker things get done.

Mr. Harry Prinsloo does not regard this action as a solution to the problem. Cape Nature's credibility is on the line and political intervention secured decisions to re-write protocol in the Western Cape. He foresees Cape Nature to act as an example for other provinces.

5.5.1 DCA Task Team WC meeting 25 August 2011

Mr. Johannes Klopper reported positively on the meeting. He would truly be disappointed if decisions don't plan out as discussed. R500 000 was given to Cape Nature to do a laptop study and they were requested to make the paper available to PMF before it is submitted to the minister. Cape Nature was specifically requested to interact with forums and not individuals.

Prof. HO de Waal expressed concern over the fact that a new study is now commissioned even though a substantial study on Black Backed Jackal is near completion. If one considers the limited resources available for research, then it is important to know what is available.

Mrs. Magdel Boshoff remarked that there is 1 discussion forum, namely the Wildlife forum, but it is not limited to certain industries. To maybe consider changing the terms of reference for PMF to become a member of the Wildlife forum.

She further referred to the DCA meeting and from government perspective, she wants to emphasise that proposals will take some time – it entails legislation changes.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

<u>Decision</u>: (1) On the proposal of Mr. Lardus van Zyl and seconded by Dr. Gert Dry, the necessary application for representation on the Wildlife Forum to serve; and (2) Necessary amendments to the Constitution re affiliations of organisations.

5.6 Research projects

5.6.1 <u>Report back from Scientific Advisory Committee (SAC)</u>

Dr. Nico Avenant gave a brief summary of why he feels that there are problems within SAC and the PMF needs to address it: (1) Glad that scientists would be incorporated in the process. At the February 2011 meeting, many scientists present; (2) Necessary to address in coordinated and holistic manner; (3) SAC was formed and persons elected. To report back to PMF in April with certain recommendations; (4) Turning point – some members did not accept the document; (5) Evaluation was circulated – 2 months later he received the recommendation summary letter from the chairman; (6) Scientists differ – you will get different opinions; (7) Members of SAC do not cooperate as they should; (8) There is a feeling of mistrust and misunderstanding within SAC; (9) Should SAC continue, it will be difficult for him to continue as chairman – he was elected to get things going; (10) He is not getting the necessary cooperation from scientists – some are more critical than others; (11) Secretary has done great job so far; (12) Think that SAC can work if linked to a time frame; and (13) SAC did not perform as well as intended.

<u>Recommendations to PMF as Chairman of SAC</u>: (1) Academic intellectual property – that is the reason why he read the final summary of the project and not from the individuals – you WILL find differences; (2) Scientists send their evaluations and PMF make the necessary recommendations; (3) If you have a SAC – you ask for comments – what will the proposal look like; (4) What is the result you expect – is it a thesis or a publication; and (5) Budget for SAC – meetings are necessary to clear any misunderstanding. Cannot just function on email correspondence alone.

The Chairman commented that he still thinks that the function of SAC is a good idea, but there is a conflict of interests. No progress has been made and what was set out in February, was not achieved.

The General Manager and Secretary were asked to excuse themselves and were excluded from the rest of the meeting.

'The following decisions were made in-committee. The Chairman, Mr. Petrus de Wet briefed the Secretary the following day for minute purposes: (1) Meeting decided to close the SAC due to non-performance; (2) PMF research to be channelled to the RMRDSA (Red Meat Research and Development, SA); (3) Request the RMRDSA that Dave Pepler acts as chairman on the subject working group which will deal with predation research; (4) Research imperative will be to identify the effect of predation (animals who eat animals) – the principles of the green economy: (a) Sustainable resource utilisation; (b) Light carbon footprint; (c) Development of rural communities; and (d) Ensure food security in Southern Africa; (5) Direct letters to DAFF and DEA re the Scientific Assessment and that no decision by the PMF or recommendation has been made on WHO the work will be done by and that the PMF will take the decision and channel the request to RMRDSA; (6) Mr. Petrus de Wet to relinquish the chairmanship of PMF and that he is available to be co-opted on the committee and that the reimbursement be the same as the national chairman of the NWGA; (7) That all industries be invoiced in the amount of R10 000 for the overall functioning of the PMF (increase of R5 000); and (8) Under no circumstances may hotel bookings, SMS and email correspondence be done under the NWGA – it must be done under PMF.'"

The annual meeting of the Predation Management Forum (PMF) was held on 31 August 2011 at the Monte Bello Estate, Bloemfontein. Excerpts of the minutes are quoted below:

Version 5.0 – HO de Waal, Version 5.0

*"Present: **NWGA** - Petrus de Wet (Chairperson), Leon de Beer (General Manager), Johannes Klopper (Mpumalanga), Niel du Preez (Eastern Cape), Niel Viljoen (Northern Cape), Thys Delport (Western Cape), Gert Loggenberg (Free State), Jan Louis Venter (Free State NWGA), Hendrik Botha (KwaZulu-Natal), **SA Mohair Growers' Assoc**. - Gerhard Grobler, Coligny Stegmann, **RPO** - Lardus van Zyl (Large Stock Industry), Gerhard Schutte (General Manager), Nic Zaayman (Free State), Corinne van Rensburg (Northern Cape), Danie Jacobs (Northern Cape), Frikkie Wentzel (Eastern Cape), John Durr (Western Cape), Eric van Wyk (North West), Koos Davel (Mpumalanga), **Wildlife Ranching SA** - Dr. Gert Dry, **ALPRU** - HO de Waal, Quinette Saffy, Walter van Niekerk, Conrad Badenhorst, **Dept. Agriculture** - Steve Galane (National), **Environmental Affairs** - Magdel Boshoff (National), Thomas Mbedzi (National), Sam Makhubele (Limpopo Province), Jaco van Deventer (Cape Nature), Wessel Jacobs (Northern Cape), Tim de Jongh (Eastern Cape), Hannes Blom (Free State), Lourens Goosen (Free State), **Scientist** - Thys de Wet, **National Museum** (**SAC**) - Nico Avenant, **Sub-Saharan Hounds men Assoc.** - Toby Cilliers and **Secretariat** - Bonita Francis. Apologies: Japie Smit – DAFF, Victor Musetha, DAFF and Bom Louw, KZN Chairman Predation Forum.*

1. OPENING AND WELCOME

Prof. HO de Waal opened the meeting with prayer. The Chairman welcomed all present and informed the forum that this would be his last meeting and that Mr. Johannes Klopper was nominated as his successor.

3 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The Minutes of the previous meeting, which were held on 21 April 2010 at Free State Agriculture, Bloemfontein was accepted with the following amendments:

1) Reference to the National Dept. of Environmental Affairs as DEA.

On the proposal of Mr. Tim de Jongh and seconded by Mr. Hendrik Botha, the minutes was adopted with the necessary changes.

4 MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

4.1 Communication Strategy

4.1.1 Media campaign

Mr. Gerhard Grobler reported on discussions with 2 media companies who proposed the following 2 levels: (1) Media campaign aimed at government, whereby pressure is applied in terms of their responsibilities to deliver on rural and social development, food security etc.; and (2) General awareness campaign whereby the general public is informed of the problem.

Decision: Questions from media companies will be circulated to Steering Committee for comments.

4.1.2 PMF Website

The matter of designing a PMF website was again raised by Mr. Gerhard Schutte. It could be used for the following: (1) Placement of important data after the harvesting of predators - Cape Nature indicated that they would record their findings; (2) Media statements. However, to be cautious about the wording because many groups can use it against us. Must not create the impression that PMF are killers of predators; (3) Image building; (4) Application for permits on-line.

Decision: (1) All in favour of the creation of an independent PMF website with links to the industries; (2) Screening of sensitive issues by PMF Steering Committee; (3) Placement of articles should be science-based; (4) Funding will come from the industries

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

(PMF "float"); and (5) Mohair Growers' Association to put framework on the table of what the website should consist of.

4.2 Constitution

Terms of reference for cognisance. No further discussion.

4.3 Progress: Norms and Standards

Ms. Magdel Boshoff briefly reported on the progress – hopefully by the end of September it will be moved to the next level. On a question by the Chairman if PMF, as biggest role player can be included in the final document, she answered that she does not know the route to take in the finalisation of the document, but that she will definitely keep the PMF up to date and invite to workshops if necessary. The Chairman again urged DEA to consider the equation of number of farmers versus liberals when taking the process forward.

5 MATTERS FOR DISCUSSION

5.1 Sub Saharan Hounds men Association (SSHA)

Mr. Toby Cilliers briefly informed the Forum of the objectives of SSHA and that they intend affiliating to bodies such as the PMF.

The Chairman said that the PMF Constitution does not allow for the affiliation of organisations.

<u>Decision</u>: Unanimous decision that the SSHA be co-opted on the PMF forum.

5.2 Report back from provincial PMF

<u>KwaZulu-Natal</u>

Hendrik Botha – PMF NWGA

- *KZN one of real problem areas.*
- *Are progressing because of good cooperation with old parks board.*
- *Provincial PMF operational, however poor involvement of stakeholders. NWGA and RPO have regional meetings.*
- *Parks Board giving successful lectures on illegal hunting.*

KZN Environmental Affairs not present at the meeting. No apology received.

<u>Mpumalanga</u>

Johannes Klopper – PMF NWGA

- *No provincial structure in place – previous structure dissolved*
- *Farmers do as they please – not applying for permits*
- *Good cooperation with parks board*

<u>Limpopo</u>

Sam Makhubele – Environmental Affairs

- *Issue permits on application*
- *Many applications in Waterberg (most leopards)*
- *20 – 30 permits issued annually*
- *Game producers have problems with not enough permits issued.*

<u>North West</u>

Mr. Eric van Wyk, North West RPO:

- *Same as in other provinces – farmers do their own thing.*
- *PMF not functioning – little sheep, isolated cases of cattle – not big problem.*
- *Mr. Lardus van Zyl does not see the necessity for PMF structure – all could be handled under the Wildlife Ranchers in the province.*

<u>Free State</u>

Version 5.0 Hector de Waal – Version 5.0

Mr. Gert Loggenberg, NWGA representative.

- *Enormous problem in the Free State – past season had R247 million in damages.*
- *Good cooperation with Environmental Affairs – training and permits. At NWGA regional meetings, plead with farmers to act responsible.*

Mr. Lourens Goosen, Environmental Affairs:

- *Bit concerned because things are exceptionally quiet with regards to permits. The farmers are either powerless or they are doing their own thing. The Dept. is however very strict to deal with the issuing of permits within 2 weeks.*
- *Jackal and Lynx are huge problems. Have given courses in private capacity on farms, because of movement towards scaling down of courses.*

Decision: Letter of good wishes to be sent to Mr. Robert Wilke, Environmental official after recovery of illness.

Northern Cape

Mr. Niel Viljoen, NWGA representative:

- *Increase in predation losses.*
- *Attempts with helicopters, but they do not address the problems of the farmers.*
- *Good cooperation with Environmental Affairs and permit system.*
- *Presented Gin Trap courses in association with the Dept.*

Mr. Wessel Jacobs, Environmental Affairs:

- *Communication between forums needs improvement.*
- *Although few officials to do training, courses are still presented.*
- *Great need to do research on Leopards. University to possibly provide somebody to get involved with project – results will assist with permit issuing.*
- *He is familiar within the Northern Cape – want to get more involved in forums – people to invite him.*

Eastern Cape

Niel du Preez, NWGA representative:

- *Increase in predation losses – to such an extent moving along the coast.*
- *Farmers are resorting to shooting from helicopters.*
- *Leopard forum good cooperation with Sanparks (if they have the necessary resources (petrol)*

Mr. Frikkie Wentzel, EC RPO:

- *Warthogs are becoming a big problem – should be included under the predation species.*

Mr. Tim de Jongh, Environmental Affairs:

- *Suggest letter be written to provincial HOD's and Working Group 1 to give support that that provincial representatives attend PMF Forum meeting. Their attendance is important. Tim is attending this meeting on his own cost.*
- *Also important to get representation of Protected Area Boards (Parks Board) on this forum.*
- *Hunting proclamations would need a permit, which is valid for 1 year. Feedback is also important – submission of statistics.*
- *Eastern Cape has a permit committee – any permit problem can be referred to them.*
- *Information day on 29 September in Graaff-Reinet re hunting proclamation.*

Western Cape

Mr. Thys Delport referred to discussions with Ministry in WC re hunting of jackal with helicopters. Plan were made and many discussions took place, but Cape Nature keeps on enforcing more laws, preventing farmers from effectively protecting their stock and livelihood. There is a sense of mistrust towards Cape Nature, which is unacceptable because farmers in the Western Cape need to cooperate with nature conservation to

Version 5.0 - HOD de Waal - Version 5.0

address the problem. The Western Cape is the ONLY province where restrictions are placed on farmers and permits are necessary for helicopters.

Mr. Jaco van Deventer, Cape Nature explained:

- *According to legislation, certain prohibited hunting methods (roep en skiet; vanghokke ens) requires permits.*
- *Certain elements within the Western Cape ("greenies" and the general public) create that Cape Nature are now in the spot light. It has become a political matter and a lot of pressure is placed because of the availability of so many tools in the toolbox for predation management.*
- *Cape Nature is currently sitting in a very uncomfortable and unfavourable position because of pressure from various groupings.*

Mr. Lardus van Zyl is of the opinion that Cape Nature regards the grouping with the largest membership base and not allows themselves to be terrorised by emotional liberals with little representation. "Is the Western Cape out of line or are we out of line" he questioned. Our constitution stipulates that farmers have the right to protect their land.

Prof. HO de Waal commented that that is precisely why the PMF forum was founded. We do the same things over again and want a different outcome. Because of fragmented approach, "Coordinated Predation Management" should be a state driven exercise and become a priority.

Mr. Johannes Klopper urged the Committee to take hands with Cape Nature and assist Mr. Jaco van Deventer by remaining involved and giving the necessary input to make the right decisions.

The following motion was carried by Dr. Gert Dry, WRSA stating that the lack of proper predation management has severe implications on food security:

"The PMF adopts a motion of extreme discomfort and distrust in the governance and regulatory protocols pertaining to predation management in the Western Cape".

The motion was seconded by the members of the Steering Committee and PMF Forum.

Decision: Unanimous decision that Motion be sent to WC Dept. Environment (Cape Nature), WC Dept. Agriculture and affiliate bodies.

6 RESEARCH PROJECTS

6.1 Existing research

6.1.1 Report back from Scientific Advisory Committee (SAC)

Dr. Nico Avenant made a detailed presentation dating back to the 24th of February 2011 when SAC received a mandate from PMF to investigate and initiate certain processes relating to predation research and structures. The proposal to the meeting: (1) To proceed with SAC in current composition. Rectify the wrong and proceed with objectives; and (2) Scientists give independent input and commentary and give recommendations to PMF for implementation.

Mr. Petrus de Wet relayed the decision taken at the Steering Committee the previous day whereby SAC should dissolve and that all research priorities be channelled to the structure of the Red Meat Industry – RMRDSA. The intention is to create a 9th cluster dealing with Predation Management. To also make use of independent scientists and expertise.

He thanked Dr. Avenant and the rest of the SAC members for their commitment and effort, which was done and executed at own cost.

Mr. Gerhard Schutte reported on the RMRDSA structure, dealing with 60 projects at a cost of R60m. He just returned from meeting the previous day whereby predation research funding was discussed. The Red Meat Industry gave R300 000 and no other

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

projects beside project from HO De Waal dealing with predation on cattle was received. He is pleased to announce that the project was approved and will be accommodated in the 9th cluster of the structure dealing with predation management.

Decision: It has been approved that funds be requested from Departments of Environmental Affairs and Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries. Once it is done, it will be considered by the PMF and channelled to the RMRDSA structure (as per decision Steering Committee meeting).

6.1.2 Proposals to DAFF – Coordinated Predation Management

6.1.3 Scientific Assessment and funds from DAFF and DEA

Mr. Petrus de Wet gave background about the proposals sent to DAFF. A briefing session was also held with Mr. Steve Galane about the short, medium and long-term goals.

Mr. Steve Galane addressed the meeting and referred to interaction between Mr. Petrus de Wet and top officials of DAFF. Mr. Langa Zita, Director General deemed it necessary to appointed him, a permanent senior official, to act as contact person on Predation related issues. Indeed, there have been many negotiations between the NWGA and the Portfolio Committee and DAFF officials, and the objective is to see that the Department have a hand in addressing issues which jeopardises food security in South Africa. As the Department have interacted with role players in the NWGA, the Department had discussions and came up with an offer and flag it here. "We are putting the best system on the table to help fight the predation problem in SA – R1 000 000. We know the request was for R140m, but this is a start and I have access to this amount of money and I want to present it to the meeting in fighting this problem with you. I am pledging R1m for the problem. From the office of the DG we are supporting this move and things be done accordingly".

Mr. Johannes Klopper presented more detail about the proposals:

Short-term goal: (1) Assist farmers financially to utilise existing structures, expertise and methods to reduce the impact of predation; and (2) Assist financially to establish national system to exchange outdated steel traps with foot holding devices.

Medium-term: Establish a system of coordinated predation management as proposed by PMF/DAFF/DEA on 16 Aug 2011 in Port Elizabeth.

Long-term: (1) Training and extension programmes; (2) Assist by utilising public funds to manage predation and mitigate impact on livestock and wildlife; and (3) DAFF needs to become responsible for creating an enabling environment for sustainable livestock and wildlife production and food security.

Decision: (1) The PMF thanked Mr. Steve Galane for this massive breakthrough. Everyone has worked extremely hard over a period of time and the PMF looks forward to the contract; and (2) The Steering Committee meets quarterly and Mr. Steve Galane is part of grouping.

6.1.4 Cooperative Research Programme (CRP)

Was covered under the Scientific Assessment.

6.1.5 Estimating the impact of predation on the beef cattle industry in SA

For cognisance. Research project, which have been approved for funding by RMRDSA.

6.2 Enquiries/Applications for research funding (NEWT)

6.2.1 "Namakwa Karnivoor Navorsingsprojek" (Cape Leopard Trust).

6.2.2 Environmental Ecology research project: Effective and sustainable controlling of small predators on sheep farms (Karlien Malan, 3rd year BSc Conservation Ecology student – Stellenbosch University).

The two applications were discussed. However, the pages submitted were vague and meaningless.

Version 5.0 - HO De Waal - Version 5.0

Decision: The Committee positively recommended that business plans be submitted to the PMF for consideration to the RMRDSA.

7 PRESENTATIONS

7.1 Scientific and practical aspects in the reduction of predators.

Mr. Thys de Wet gave a presentation concerning the above topic and left the committee members with some valuable practical tips.

7.2 Training Courses on DCA

Mr. Neil Viljoen gave a presentation on DCA Training Courses he presented country wide.

Mr. Lardus van Zyl expressed concern by farmers over duplication and enquired about cooperation between Neil Viljoen and HO De Waal and the possibility of supplementing one another.

Prof. HO De Waal referred to follow-up research work that was done in the Northern Cape, which coincidentally converged on the same day as tasks performed by Neil Viljoen.

Ms. Magdel Boshoff requires agricultural assistance when determining regulations relating to the use of control methods (gin traps). Specifically relating to training whereby trained person using devices or methods using bar coding and accreditation could possibly be exempted from legislation?

Mr. Leon de Beer informed the meeting that Neil Viljoen's work will be filmed and used as training material according to Agri SETA standards.

Mr. Tim de Jongh said that they need guidelines, example keeping animals in captivity and using urine as bait.

Proposal that we ask HO de Waal – how is it done by them and determine if it applies to us.

Decision: Agenda of the next Steering Committee meeting.

8 PMF new Chairman

The meeting is unanimous that newly elected chairman come from the ranks of the NWGA. Mr. Johannes Klopper was introduced to the meeting as the new chairman of the PMF.

Mr. Petrus de Wet did the necessary acknowledgements and thanked people for their contribution in his term of chairmanship."

On 31 August 2011, Prof. HO de Waal gave a presentation[846] on behalf of ALPRU regarding a system of coordinated predation management to the PMF Steering Committee, Monte Bello Estate, Bloemfontein, Free State Province.

On 1 September 2011, Prof. HO de Waal gave a presentation[847] on the Canis-Caracal Programme and predation management to a farmers' study group, Jacobsdal, Northern Cape Province.

[846] De Waal, HO, 2011. A system of coordinated predation management in South Africa – lessons learnt and a way forward. Drawing on interactions with the USDA-APHIS Wildlife Services and other role players in Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Arizona and Texas from 17-28 May 2010. PMF Steering Committee. 30-31 August 2011. Monte Bello Estate, Bloemfontein, South Africa.

[847] De Waal, HO, 2011. A system of coordinated predation management in South Africa – lessons learnt and a way forward. Drawing from interactions with the USDA-APHIS Wildlife Services and other role players in Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Arizona and Texas from 17-28 May 2010. Wei en Lei Studiegroep. 1 September 2011. Jacobsdal, Vrystaat Provinsie, Suid-Afrika.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

Prof. HO de Waal, Mr. Jurie du Plessis, Mrs. Quinette Saffy, Mr. Andries Strauss and Mr. Walter van Niekerk presented scientific papers[848],[849],[850],[851],[852]on predation management at the 7th International Wildlife Ranching Symposium from 10-13 October 2011 at the Protea Hotel, Kimberley, Northern Cape Province.

On 20 October 2011, the Extension & Advisory Services of the Department of Agriculture, Provincial Government of the Western Cape hosted a Predation Management Information Day for the Central Karoo at the Matoppo Inn in Beaufort West, Western Cape Province. Prof. HO de Waal gave a presentation[853] on predation management. Four ALPRU co-workers also gave PowerPoint presentations (see programme)[854], namely Dr. Nico Avenant, Mr. Walter van Niekerk, Me. Quinette Saffy and Mr. Andries Strauss.

2012

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

[848] De Waal, H.O, Saffy, Quinette, Van Niekerk, H.N. & Avenant, N.L., 2011. Advances towards a system of coordinated predation management in South Africa. 7th International Wildlife Ranching Symposium. 10-13 October 2011. Kimberley, South Africa.

[849] Du Plessis, J., Avenant, N.L. & De Waal, H.O., 2011. A synthesis of ecological research on black-backed jackal and caracal: application to human-wildlife conflict management in South Africa. 7th International Wildlife Ranching Symposium. 10-13 October 2011. Kimberley, South Africa.

[850] Saffy, Quinette & De Waal, H.O., 2011. A method to analyse data on the control of damage-causing predators. 7th International Wildlife Ranching Symposium. 10-13 October 2011. Kimberley, South Africa.

[851] Strauss, A., De Waal, H.O. & Avenant, N.L., 2011. The impact of predation on a sheep enterprise in the Free State Province, South Africa. 7th International Wildlife Ranching Symposium. 10-13 October 2011. Kimberley, South Africa.

[852] Van Niekerk, H.N., Taljaard, P.J., Grové, B. & De Waal, H.O., 2011. The extent and impact of predation on small livestock in South Africa. 7th International Wildlife Ranching Symposium. 10-13 October 2011. Kimberley, South Africa.

[853] De Waal, HO, 2011. Advances towards a system of coordinated predation management in South Africa. Informed by interacting with the USDA-APHIS Wildlife Services and other role players in Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Arizona and Texas from 17-28 May 2010. Predator Management Information Day. 20 October 2011. Department of Agriculture, Western Cape Province, Central Karoo. Matoppo Inn, Beaufort West, Western Cape Province, South Africa.

[854] Predation Management Information Day Programme - 20 October 2011

08h00-08h55	*Registration and Tea*	*Me. A. Van der Linde*
08h55-09h00	*Opening and Purpose*	*Mr. F. Mpona*
09h00-09h30	*Food Security*	*Mr. M. Sebopetsa*
09h30-10h00	*The function of the PMF (Western Cape)*	*Mr. M. Delport*
10h00-10h45	*Advances towards a system of coordinated predation management in SA - Informed by interacting with the USDA-APHIS Wildlife Services & other role players in Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Arizona and Texas from 17–28 May 2010)*	*Prof. H.O. de Waal*
TEA BREAK		
11h00-11h30	*The problem, and dealing with it - An ecologist's perspective*	*Dr. N. Avenant*
11h30-12h00	*The extend and impact of predation on small livestock in SA*	*Mr. H. van Niekerk*
12h00-12h30	*A method to analyse data on the control of damage – causing*	*Me Q. Saffy*
12h30-13h00	*The impact of predation on a sheep enterprise in the Free State*	*Mr. A. Strauss*
LUNCH BREAK		
14h00-14h30	*Are hunting clubs the solution to sheep predation in SA?*	*Dr. B. Conradie*
14h30-15h00	*The Field Broadcaster*	*Dr. H. Lourens*
15h00-15h30	*Effective predator control*	*Mr. P. Schneekluth*
15h00-16h00	*Discussion and way forward*	

On 16 February 2012, Prof. HO de Waal, Mrs. Quinette Saffy, Mr. Andries Strauss and Mr. Walter van Niekerk gave presentations[855],[856],[857],[858] on predation management at a Predator Management Information Day, Glen Agricultural Institute, Free State Province.

The 7th Meeting of the PMF Steering Committee was held on 29 March 2012 at the NWGA Head Office in Port Elizabeth. Excerpts from the minutes are quoted below[859]]:

"**1. *OPENING AND WELCOME***

Mr. Johannes Klopper chaired the meeting for the first time. Mr. Coligny Stegmann opened the meeting with prayer.

2. APOLOGIES

Magdel Boshoff – DEA, Thomas Mbedzi – DEA, Herman Barnard – WRSA and Dale Cunningham – WRSA.

The meeting took cognizance that an invitation to attend was addressed to the MPO but they indicated that their involvement would depend on a council decision to be taken at the next Council meeting. It is important to note that their involvement is necessary, but if they do not make a financial contribution to PMF like all the other industries, they cannot become part of the system.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the previous meeting, which were held on 30 August 2011 at the Monte Bello Estate, Bloemfontein was approved on the proposal of Gerhard Grobler and seconded by HO de Waal with the following change:

Page 4 – Coordinated predation management in SA

…….. He briefly referred to "the 7th International Wildlife Ranching Symposium in Kimberley", which will be held in Kimberley.

4. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES			
Discussion Point	*Brief discussion*	*Action*	*Responsible person(s)*
4.1 DCA as disaster declaration	*Steve Galane from DAFF indicated at the previous meeting that he will give his attention to the matter. Nothing further has been done. The meeting reiterated the fact the predators and stock theft are the largest threat to farmers.*	*To step away from the matter.*	
4.2 Media Campaign	*Gerhard Grobler reported that due to internal staff changes within Mohair SA and no feed-back from companies, the prospects of a media campaign has dwindled. In his private capacity*		

[855] De Waal, HO, 2012. Advances towards a system of coordinated predation management in South Africa. Informed by interacting with the USDA-APHIS Wildlife Services and other role players in Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Arizona and Texas from 17-28 May 2010. Predator Management Information Day. 16 February 2012. Department of Agriculture & Rural Development Free State Province, Glen Agricultural Institute, Free State Province, South Africa.

[856] Saffy, Quinette & De Waal, H.O., 2012. A method to analyse data on the control of damage causing animals. Technology transfer on predation management, Central Free State. 16 February 2012. Department of Agriculture & Rural Development, Glen Agricultural Institute, Free State Province, South Africa.

[857] Strauss, Andries, De Waal, H.O. & Avenant, N.L., 2012. The impact of predation on a sheep enterprise in the Free State region. Technology transfer on predation management, Central Free State. 16 February 2012. Department of Agriculture & Rural Development, Glen Agricultural Institute, Free State Province, South Africa.

[858] Van Niekerk, Walter, Taljaard, P.R., Grové, B. & De Waal, H.O., 2012. The extent of predation management in the Free State Province of South Africa. Technology transfer on predation management, Central Free State. 16 February 2012. Department of Agriculture & Rural Development, Glen Agricultural Institute, Free State Province, South Africa.

[859] Editor's Note: except for names listed in the Opening and Welcome, the Apologies and elsewhere in the minutes, no attendance register of those present was recorded.

Version 5.0 – HO de Waal

	he visited 6 stores including Woolworths to get info from public on predation issues. He was shocked to observe that only 1 out of 50 ladies that he interviewed were aware that farmers are experiencing predation problems in their farms. *Coligny Stegmann expressed disbelief at predation articles which is published in the media. By publishing the articles, the problem of predation is low-key, which impacts on negotiations with Government and other.* *Lardus van Zyl is of the opinion that progress has most definitely taken place because many activists are no longer appearing on platforms. Communication is however the biggest challenge and a communication strategy should be implemented. Many meetings are wasted because of internal quarrels.* *At the next meeting, scheduled for 17 July 2012, to include one extra day to discuss a media & communication strategy for predation.* *Gerhard Schutte is of the opinion that a total strategy needs to be set, including policy. If we have policy paper on the table, we can all talk out of one mouth. To make use of a facilitator.* *Arthur Kidman remarked that the media strategy should include a scientific and practical side. To utilize festivals and Expos (such as Kirkwood festival) to set up booths and spread the message of predation.*	*Media/Communication strategy to be discussed at the next meeting on 20 June 2012.* *Facilitator Emmie Pieterse to be approached for the session. She has gained recognition with other commodity organisations.* *Set up appointment with editor of Landbouweekblad re the publishing of predation articles. To encourage good positive articles, which expands the situation and assist the farmer in controlling the problem.*	*Bonita Francis* *Gerhard Schutte contacted her during the meeting – Bonita Francis to follow up.* *Johannes Klopper*
4.3 Scientific Assessment	*Discussed under Point 6.2 – Research Projects*		
4.4 DAFF – R140 million	*Johannes Klopper spoke to Mandla Lukhele from DAFF and explained the importance and absolute necessity for DAFF to take up their responsibility of Food Security. We will provide them with all the necessary documents in order for them to me the necessary decisions. It is also important that DAFF and DEA work together. He again referred to the short-, medium- and long term goals, which are the future strategies for predation.*	*If you have a project on the table, you need to be specific – approach should be right.* *The PMF as a structured representative forum is the only structure that Government should work with.*	
4.5 Western Cape Predation management	*The meeting took cognizance of correspondence relating to progress in negotiations with Cape Nature. Johannes Klopper reported briefly.* *Arthur Rudman referred to a community predator control system whereby land owners are grouped in units. Must promote effective*	*For cognizance.*	

Version 5.0 - HS de Waal - Version 5.0

	participation, which will result in effect control. He has already started organizing units in his area. This relates to the practical side of predation management and must be implemented.		
5. MATTERS FOR DISCUSSION			
Forward planning	*Johannes Klopper gave feedback on his chairmanship during the past 6 months, which included solving personal issues between individuals and influencing the negativity of Cape Nature.*	*Members to receive updates on the whereabouts of the chairman. Other methods of communication to be discussed at Media Session.*	*Bonita Francis*
5.2 Report back by Industry representative	*Members briefly reported on activities within industries.*	*For cognizance*	
5.3 Gathering and processing of predation data/statistics	*The meeting discussed the credibility of gathering and processing data. As long as data is science-based, it will eliminate any misperceptions and poor reviews.*	*Circulate 3 X scientific lectures (Walter van Niekerk, Niel Viljoen and Andries – Glen).*	*Bonita Francis*
5.4 Neil Viljoen DVD	*Training DVD of Niel Viljoen will be sold – to be translated into English, Xhosa, Zulu and Sotho.*	*For cognizance*	
5.5 Provincial legislation *5.6 Progress: Court case Harrison White/NWGA/Thys De Wet*	*Provincial legislation to be circulated to Committee.* *The meeting took cognizance that the Plaintiff, Harrison-White has not taken further steps in the matter since February 2010. On advice from Joubert Galpin Searle it makes no sense to incur legal costs to enrol the matter and that the file be closed.*	*For cognizance* *For cognizance*	*Bonita Francis*
5.7 Progress – DCA Norms and Standards	*The meeting took cognizance of progress. Comments on draft N&S received during the public participation process, have been assessed. However, the finalization of the contents of the N&S will be done as soon as the amendments to the TOPS Regulations and species list (currently underway) have been completed. The contents of N&S will therefore depend on the species that will be included in the list, which in turn will inform the management methods that need to be provided for in the TOPS regulations.*	*The meeting took cognizance of the fact that provincial ordinances actually dominate TOPS and N&S.* *Need to realize that we were participated in the process and await legislation to be implemented.*	
6. RESEARCH PROJECTS			
6.1 Mohair Congress – funding for predation research	*Thank you letter from Mohair Growers Association towards PMF for all their efforts in combating the predation problem.* *RMRD to also take cognizance of the fact that companies need to be approached for research funding because they ultimately benefit if predation losses are less.* *Lardus van Zyl remarked that there are no structures in the North West Province. (predation training courses)?*	*For cognizance.* *Establish a structure in North West Province (get the numbers from North West RPO).*	*Amie to physically go to North West to establish a structure.*

Version 5.0 – HD Du Waal – Version 5.0

6.2 Proposal for the Scientific Assessment – Stock Predation	*Johannes Klopper reported on his meeting with DAFF – Dr. Julius Jaftha and Mandla Lukhele. An email was received confirming funding towards a Scientific Assessment. In principle all parties (DEA and DAFF) are in agreement that SA must continue.* *A proposal was received from the Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University, Port Elizabeth and will now be presented to the RMRD (9th focus area under chairmanship of Tino Herselman).* *Gerhard Schutte enquired if RMRD can meet with Dr. Jaftha to address the content of the SA – R1 million is a lot of money and he feels that more can be done on grass-roots level. To determine the best expenditure of funding to best solve the problem.*	*RMRD to discuss loopholes within SA with DAFF and present to PMF for final approval.* *To write a letter to DEA to inform them of R1 million allocation from DAFF. Seeking official confirmation of allocation of R500 000*	*Gerhard Schutte* *?*
6.2.1 Letter to Minister Anton Bredell – PMF support towards Scientific Assessment	*For cognizance*	*For cognizance*	
6.3 Wildlife Industry – needs analysis of predation losses *6.4 Coordinated Predation Management (arising)*	*Considering that surveys have been done in small stock and large stock industries, the meeting enquired whether it should be done in the wild life industry. It will strengthen negotiations with government.* *HO De Waal said that if South Africa wants to be effective in managing predation, it should call on a coordinated predation management approach, which is state driven. Until that stage, it is a recording system.* *Coligny Stegmann proposed that HO de Waal accompany DAFF members (Julius Jaftha and Mandla Lukhela) to America to show them the system first hand.*	*Arthur Rudman to take the matter up with their President.* *Perhaps a letter from PMF to RMRD to put a proposal on the table – pro-actively start looking for funds.* *Issue to remain on the Agenda.* *To discuss the possibility with DAFF – Mike Modisane, Chief Director Animal Health is the right person to talk to.*	*Arthur Rudman* *Gerhard Schutte* *Johannes Klopper*
6.5 Funding for research	*Johannes Klopper urged commodity groupings to now already determine their research needs. If future funding is secured, research needs should be tabled. It must actually be part of commodity budgets.*	*Chairpersons to act proactively and write letters to their industries requesting research needs and allocate budget to it.*	

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

6.6 Steering Committee members	*Gerhard Schutte explained how the system works with the RMRD – research proposals are placed on website under the "pro-active" component. PMF would ultimately have veto right on the proposed research.* *It is the opinion of the Chairman that the composition of PMF Steering Committee should be members of the industries only. Should HO de Waal be required to attend, he will be invited specifically.*	*Proposal as received to RMRD – they must put out on contract to put more proposals on the table.* *Steering Committee to comprise of industry representatives only – other persons to attend by invitation*	

At the PMF Steering Committee meeting of 29 March 2012, Dr. Amie Aucamp presented on behalf of Mr. Niël Viljoen (PowerPoint) information[860] regarding the demonstration/monitor farms and training, although no specific record of such input is listed in the minutes. Among others, a map identified the broad locations of 21 demonstration/monitor farms in South Africa, comprising two farms in the Western Cape, six farms in the Northern Cape, four farms in the Eastern Cape, five farms in the Free State, two farms in KwaZulu-Natal and two farms in Mpumalanga. Furthermore, a graph summarised the total livestock (sheep) losses and the number of predators killed (in brackets) for six of the demonstration/monitor farms (locations/provinces unknown) in four consecutive years: 317 (30) – 2008; 244 (42) – 2009; 304 (46) – 2010; and 278 (81) - 2011.

On 29 March 2012, the Steering Committee of the PMF resolved that its members should only be industry representatives and other persons to attend by invitation. This decision was taken at the first meeting after Mr. Petrus de Wet has stepped down as a long serving founding member and chairperson of the PMF. During his leadership, Mr. de Wet encouraged scientific input to ensure a balanced and professional view of predation management. Ostensibly, this was the dawn of a subtle sidelining of individuals and excluding them from being present at PMF Steering Committee meetings. This may unintentionally have resulted in sight being lost of the broader goal of coordinated predation management.

On 11 April 2012, Prof. HO de Waal gave a presentation[861] on coordinated predation management to hunters of a Free State provincial hunting association at the Lettie Fouché Lapa, Bloemfontein, Free State Province.

The Predation Management Forum held a Strategic Planning Session on 16 and 17 July 2012 at the Farmers Folly Guest House in Pretoria. Mr. David Bergman, Arizona State Director: Wildlife Services (USDA/APHIS) in Arizona, USA was invited to present an overview on Predation Management in the USA: the Federal Wildlife Services Program. The programme for the two-day event is quoted below:

"Strategic Planning Session of the Predation Management Forum (PMF)

Facilitator: Emmie Pietersen, BathoPele Consultant
BathoPele – leading supplier of people Business Solutions, which specialise in the development, implementation and management of workable staff solutions and training and development programmes.

[860] Editor's Note: A copy of the PowerPoint file was sourced from a colleague.
[861] De Waal, HO, 2012. Advances towards a system of coordinated predation management in South Africa. Informed by interacting with the USDA-APHIS Wildlife Services and other role players in Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Arizona and Texas from 17-28 May 2010. Vrystaatse Jagters- en Wildbewaringsvereniging. 11 April 2012. Lettie Fouché Lapa, Bloemfontein, Suid-Afrika.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

Attendees: Johannes Klopper (PMF Chairman), Gerhard Grobler (SA Mohair Growers' Association), Coligny Stegmann (SA Mohair Growers' Association, Gerhard Schutte (RPO, Small Stock Industry), Herman Barnard (Wildlife Ranching SA (attendance 16th July only), Dale Cunningham (Wildlife Ranching SA (attendance 17th July only), Julian Jaftha (Dept. of Agriculture), Keith Ramsay (Dept. of Agriculture), HO de Waal (ALPRU), David Bergman (State Director: Wildlife Services Arizona, US), Harry Prinsloo (NWGA), Leon de Beer (NWGA) and Bonita Francis (Secretariat).

Monday, 16 July 2012

Session 1 (13:00 – 17:00 = 4 hours)

13:00 Introduction by Emmie Pietersen

13:30 – 14:10 Presentation by David Bergman, State Director: Wildlife Services, Arizona US

(30 min/latest 40 min) 'How the federal system is operating and cooperating with the Arizona Fish and Game Department, as well as the involvement of livestock producers, other stakeholders in activities/funding'

14:10 – 14:30 Questions

Tuesday, 17 July 2012

Session 2 (08:00 – 12:00 = 4 hours)

Media- and Communication Strategy"

In a comprehensive PowerPoint presentation at the PMF Strategic Planning Session, Mr. David Bergman, Arizona State Director: Wildlife Services (USDA/APHIS) alluded to his first-hand professional practical experience in predation management in the USA, spanning a career of 25 years.

The annual meeting of the Predation Management Forum (PMF) was held on Thursday, 30 August 2012 at the Jakkalsdraai Conference Centre in Bainsvlei, Bloemfontein. No minutes could be sourced yet.

2013

In a Memorandum dated 25 March 2013, Dr. Kas Hamman, Acting Chief Executive Officer of CapeNature, garnered support from two MEC's for the conclusion of a co-operative agreement between the Predator Management Forum[862] (Western Cape) and the Western Cape Nature Conservation Board, trading as CapeNature. The Memorandum was specifically aimed at managing three wildlife species, namely bush pigs, black-backed jackals and caracals that are responsible for agricultural losses in the Western Cape Province.

This was a first bold step in reaching agreement on co-operative predation management in South Africa and from 2-24 April 2013, the parties signed the memorandum setting up the agreement. Excerpts from the important memorandum to the two MEC's, Minister Bredell[863] and Minister Van Rensburg[864], are quoted below:

"*PURPOSE*

The purpose of this memorandum is to obtain the support of the two MEC's for the conclusion of a Co-operative Agreement between the Predator Management Forum (Western Cape) and the Western Cape Nature Conservation Board trading as CapeNature.

[862] Note: the name *Predator* Management Forum was used instead of *Predation* Management Forum.
[863] MEC: Anton Bredell: Minister of Local Government, Environmental Affairs and Development Planning.
[864] MEC: Gerrit van Rensburg: Minister of Local Government, Agriculture.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

1. BACKGROUND

1.1 The purpose of this agreement is to allow commercial, new- and upcoming farmers and communities to manage bush pig, black-backed jackal and caracal more effectively. This agreement is based on the principles contained in the draft National Norms & Standards for the management of Damage-Causing Animals, as published in the General Notice Nr. 1084 of the Government Gazette Nr. 33806, dated November 26, 2010. The management of any other wild animals that may cause losses in the agricultural sector will be dealt with according to CapeNature policies, and Legislation.

1.2 According to the above mentioned draft Norms and Standards, the definition for a damage-causing animal is:

*'**damage-causing animal**' means a wild vertebrate animal that, when interacting with humans or interfering with human activities, and after implementation of reasonable mitigation management options, there is still substantial proof that it-*

(a) causes losses to stock or to other wild specimens;
(b) causes damage to cultivated trees, crops, natural flora or other property;
(c) presents a threat to human life; or
(d) is present in such numbers that agricultural grazing is materially depleted.

1.3 This co-operative agreement will only deal with damage or losses caused by bush pig, black-backed jackal and caracal, so the definition for damage-causing animal in terms of this agreement will be:

*'**damage-causing animal**' means in respect of bush pig, caracal or black-backed jackal that, after implementation of reasonable mitigation management options, there is still proof that it is responsible for substantial agricultural losses.*

2. HISTORY

2.1 1654: Jan van Riebeeck's journal for 30 March 1654 (p.221) indicates some of the problems he was having with his small livestock, from the steady losses of sheep on the mainland: "on account of the extensive wetness of the ground caused by the river; many are carried away and devoured every day by leopards, lions and jackal.'(Skead: 205)*[865] *'Despite heavy persecution by small stock farmers, over many decades, the species has persisted in most areas. It appears to have recolonised areas where it was exterminated by farmers'*(Skead: 207)*

2.2 Pre-2009: The conflict between farmers and caracal and lack backed jackal continues – The livestock industry is essentially self-regulated. Some farmers target biodiversity in general, stock and biodiversity losses increases. The methods allowed included: poison, gin trap/cage trap, public road, night shooting, artificial light, .22 rim fire rifle, semi-automatic weapon, bow and arrow and dogs, for most of this period, but some methods were systematically phased out. No limit was placed during this period on the number of predators that may be hunted.

2.3 2009-2010: CapeNature initiates its permit system to manage DCAs including black backed jackal and caracal. The goal is to tighten control in the management of these animals. A three-month permit is available to farmers. The permit allowed the night hunting of five jackal and five caracal per night. No permit was needed to shoot predators during daylight hours and for the use of cage traps.

2.4 During 2010 commercial farmers demanded drastic measures to control and reduce jackal and caracal numbers, reportedly responsible for unusually high stock numbers. Reports to both Ministers of the Environment & Development Planning and Agriculture resulted in high-level meetings in an attempt to resolve this matter. Requests were received from organised agriculture to declare black-backed jackal and caracal as

[865] Skead, C.J., 1987. Historical Mammal Incidence in the Cape Province. Volume 2: The Eastern Half of the Cape Province, Including the Ciskei, Transkei and East Griqualand. Chief Directorate Nature and Environmental Conservation of the Provincial Administration of the Cape of Good Hope, Cape Town, South Africa.

Version 5.0 - PO de Waal - Version 5.0

a disaster in the Western Cape Province. This among other would have led to the large-scale hunting of these two species.

The Minister for DEA&DP then decided that the responsible way to address this issue was to scientifically investigate the implementation of sustainable management options which are selective, humane, and legal and ecologically sound as a long-term solution.

2.5 During 2010 CapeNature changed the time period of DCA permits from three to six months (with the same conditions), to ease the administration burden and to assist the farmers. As previously, the renewal of this permit was subject to the submission of a detailed report on the number of stock losses and DCAs hunted during this period

Between January 2009 and 31 May 2011, CapeNature issued a total of 357 DCA three month permits.

Between July - December 2011 CapeNature issued 400 six month permits.

2.6 ***Feedback from six month permit holders***

To date, feedback has been received from 46 out of the 400 DCA permit holders on the following numbers per species hunted:

Caracal – 190

Black-backed jackal – 135

The above statistics indicate that the extremely high number of animals hunted, as often quoted by the landmark Foundation, is unrealistic and totally out of line with what is happening in practice. Jackal and caracal are both shy and nocturnal animals and are not easy to hunt. A landowner typically does not have the time, knowledge and resources to hunt five animals per night, seven days a week, for six months – as incorrectly assumed by the Landmark Foundation. The number five was given to landowners as a way to show CapeNature is serious about limiting the number of DCAs that may be hunted per night.

3. MOTIVATION

3.1 The support of this agreement by the Provincial Government will, for the interim, allow commercial, new- and upcoming farmers and communities to manage bush pig, black-backed jackal and caracal more effectively and sustainable. After a period of one year, the efficacy of this agreement will be evaluated and amended as ay be required as part of an on-going monitoring process.

3.2 It should be kept in mind that this agreement is based on the principles contained in the draft National Norms & Standards for the Management of Damage-Causing animals, as published in the General Notice Nr. 1084 of the Government Gazette Nr. 33806, dated November 26, 2010. Once these National Norms & standards become effective, this agreement will fall away.

4. PERSONNEL IMPLICATIONS

There are no personnel implications for the Province.

5. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

Implementations of the Protocol will be in line with the provisions of the Western Cape Nature Conservation Ordinance 19 of 1974.

6. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

CapeNature will continue to provide advice, training and information to affected commercial farmers in terms of the management of Damage-Causing Animals referred to in the agreement.

7. COMMUNICATION ACTION

The envisaged acceptance of this agreement will be communicated to all interested and affected parties through Government Gazette, media briefings, articles and posted on the relevant social media sites.

8. RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that the attached Co-operative Agreement between the Predator management Forum (Western-Cape) and the Western Cape Nature Conservation

Version 5.0 - MD de Waal - Version 5.0

Boards trading as CapeNature be entered into to manage bush pig, black-backed jackal and caracal more effectively."

The co-operative agreement (dated August 2013) comprised a comprehensive list of guidelines[866] and is quoted below with its Annexure 1 [the comprehensive and detailed Annexures 2 to 11 are not quoted]:

"1. *Background*

Following a meeting held on September 16, 2011 between both MEC's Bredell and Van Rensburg, the Predator Management Forum ("PMF") and CapeNature, it was agreed that a co-operative agreement should be drafted to serve as a basis for the management of damage-causing bush pig, caracal and black-backed jackal (DCAs) within the Western Cape Province. The PMF and CapeNature agreed, as partners, to base the management of DCA's on holistic principles in order to promote food security and to conserve biodiversity. The holistic approach, in respect of the methods used to manage DCAs, is based on the following principles:

1. *It must be humane;*
2. *It must be selective (target the individual responsible for the losses);*
3. *It must be ecologically acceptable;*
4. *It must be within the legal framework; and*
5. *It must be efficient and cost-effective.*

The focus of an holistic approach to the management of DCAs is based on preventing or minimizing of losses by wild animals through the implementation of mitigation measures (See Annexure 1).

The purpose of this agreement is to allow producers to manage bush pig, black-backed jackal and caracal more effectively. This agreement is based on the principles contained in the draft Norms & Standards for the Management of Damage-Causing Animals, as published in the General Notice Nr. 1084 of the Government Gazette Nr. 33806, dated November 26, 2010. The management of any other wild animals that may cause losses in the agricultural sector will be dealt with according to CapeNature policies. According to the above mentioned draft Norms and Standards, the definition for a damage-causing animal is:

"damage-causing animal" means a wild vertebrate animal that, when interacting with humans or interfering with human activities, and after implementation of reasonable mitigation management options, there is still substantial proof that it—

(a) causes losses to stock or to other wild specimens;
(b) causes damage to cultivated trees, crops, natural flora or other property;
(c) presents a threat to human life; or
(d) is present in such numbers that agricultural grazing is materially depleted;

This co-operative agreement will only deal with damage or losses caused by bush pig, black-backed jackal and caracal, so the definition for a damage-causing animal in terms of this agreement will be:

"damage-causing animal" means in respect of bush pig, caracal or black-backed jackal that, after implementation of reasonable mitigation management options, there is still proof that it is responsible for substantial agricultural losses.

During the discussions, a range of subjects were discussed, including the different mitigation measures that producers can implement to minimise losses (See 9.) The industry proposed different methods, according to the draft Norms and Standards, that they would like to implement through CapeNature's permit system. The following

[866] CapeNature, 2013. Co-operative agreement between the Predator Management Forum (Western-Cape) and the Western Cape Nature Conservation Board trading as CapeNature: Guidelines for the management of bushpig, black-backed jackal and caracal that are responsible for agricultural losses within the boundaries of the Western Cape Province.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

methods were agreed upon, as discussed under point 10.

- *cage Traps*
- *"call-and-shoot" at night*
- *small stock protection collars*
- *approved leg hold devices ("soft traps")*
- *hunting dogs (used as "sniffer" dogs)*
- *hunting with a helicopter in an experimental area*

This co-operative agreement makes provision for the management of DCAs by the private landowner as the hunter, as well as co-operative management of DCAs through the District Agricultural Union (DAU) or Agricultural Union (AU). This document will make a distinction between the management of DCAs by a private landowner and the management of DCAs by a DAU/AU.

2. <u>The Parties</u>

2.1 <u>CapeNature</u>

The Western Cape Nature Conservation Board, trading as CapeNature, is the conservation authority mandated with biodiversity conservation in the Western Cape. CapeNature functions in terms of the Western Cape Nature Conservation Board Act, Act 15 of 1998. In terms of Section 9(f) and (g) of this Act, CapeNature may work together with any organization to promote nature conservation and may enter into co-operation agreements in order to achieve the objects of the Board.

CapeNature's mandate with regards to the management of DCAs is as follows:

a) the formulation, administration and application of legislation;

b) the provision of information and training with reference to the management of DCA's;

c) the prevention of unacceptable or unselective management methods; and

d) the promotion and support of research into DCA's.

2.2 <u>Predator Management Forum (PMF)</u>

The PMF represents the following agricultural organisations, Agri Wes-Kaap, Red Meat Producers Organisation, National Wool Growers and the Mohair Growers' Association. Experts in specific fields can be co-opted to assist in the responsible management of DCA's. These Forums is therefore also affiliated to the national body where all producers of large and small stock as well as game are represented.

The PMF must keep all Western Cape members informed and up-to-date regarding the content of this agreement.

3. <u>Matters of Common Interest</u>

CapeNature and the PMF have reached consensus regarding the following:

3.1 CapeNature has the legal mandate and responsibility to conserve and manage biodiversity in the Western Cape;

3.2 Producers experience stock and crop losses as a result of bush pig, caracal and black-backed jackal;

3.3 In terms of the Common Law, every person have the right to protect his/her property, but the exercise of this right must take place within the existing legal framework;

3.4 CapeNature and the PMF must ensure that the management methods applied to manage DCA's should not be detrimental to biodiversity or agricultural products;

3.5 Management methods that are applied must be effective and selective;

3.6 The management of DCA's remains the responsibility of the producer and is an inherent part of the production process;

3.7 CapeNature and the PMF must ensure that the management methods applied to manage DCA's must conform to the existing legal framework, as well as existing norms

Version 5.0 - To be Water Version 5.0

and standards. Within 30 days after the finalization of the National Norms and Standards for the management of DCAs, this protocol document will be revised;

3.8 CapeNature and the PMF agree that management of DCA's in accordance with this agreement must take place in a responsible manner;

3.9 Producers undertake to collect data in terms of this agreement to inform future research towards the effectiveness of certain methods and management practices and CapeNature will assimilate the data and give feedback to the PMF;

3.10 This document forms the basis for the management of DCA's within the Western Cape Province.

4. <u>Common Objectives</u>

4.1 To apply management methods in such a manner that the balance between commercial agriculture (food security) and biodiversity is enhanced.

4.2 To ensure that landowners act in such a manner that:

4.2.1 non-target species are not negatively affected in the process; and

4.2.2 the natural environment (soil, water, vegetation and naturally occurring wildlife) are not prejudiced in the process.

4.3 To promote the sustainable and economic utilisation of all resources.

4.4 To take decisions jointly in order to determine which management methods achieve the best results.

5. <u>Responsibilities of the Agricultural Union as permit holder:</u>

A permit to use certain prohibited hunting methods, as specified in section 29 and 33 of the Nature Conservation Ordinance 19 of 1974, will be issued by CapeNature to a DAU/AU. The DAU/AU shall nominate a responsible person who will ensure that the application form (as attached in Annexure 2) is fully completed and submitted to CapeNature. CapeNature will then evaluate the application accordingly.

If the applicant does not plan to personally undertake the management action, he must authorise a nominated person to perform said management action by completing the document attached in Annexure 3. This document must be submitted along with the application for a permit and the details of said nominated person shall be listed on the permit that may be issued.

5.1 It is the DAU/AU's responsibility to identify all hunters who may hunt in terms of this agreement within the DAU/AU jurisdiction. The names and details of said hunters must be provided to all DAU/AU members in order to enable them to issue the relevant written permission (as per Annexure 3).

5.2 The area of jurisdiction of each DAU/AU must be clearly defined, and this must include the name of all farms that are located with said area of jurisdiction. The boundaries of the area within which the DAU/AU functions must be properly mapped in order to prevent confusion surrounding the area of responsibility. The DAU/AU must obtain the written permission (as per Annexure 3) from all landowners with the DAU/AU's area of jurisdiction authorising the management of DCA's on their properties within the legal framework and in accordance with agreed principles. This written permission shall remain valid until the property changes ownership or the written permission is revoked.

5.3 This written permission for the hunting of DCA's as listed in Annexure 3 complies with all legal requirements.

5.4 Each member of a DAU/AU, on provision of the written permission (as per Annexure 3), agrees to bind himself to co-operate with the DAU/AU and/or its authorised person(s). Any hunting in terms of said written permission is subject to prior notification of the landowner.

5.5 Members of a DAU/AU must, in said written permission, also confirm that they shall

Version 5.0 - Hlude Wad

strive to:

5.5.1 ensure that non-target species are not harmed in the process;

5.5.2 ensure that the environment is not negatively affected in the process;

5.5.3 only use management methods detailed in this agreement; and

5.5.4 report any instance of damage caused by a wild animal falling outside the purview of this agreement to CapeNature. Each incident of this nature will be dealt with according to CapeNature protocol and policies. In the case of damage caused by stray dogs, the matter must be reported to the local authority.

5.6 It is the DAU/AU's responsibility to ensure that the content of the information document (attached as Annexure 4) is comprehensively communicated to all DAU/AU members. The DAU/AU must also ensure that the completed information document and written permission in enclosed in all applications.

5.7 The Management of the DAU/AU or the elected representative will be responsible for all administration and includes:

5.7.1 the collation of all written permission and information documents as completed by DAU/AU members (Annexures 3 & 4);

5.7.2 the maintenance of a complete list of all details of each DAU/AU member; and

5.7.3 the provision of all details of accredited hunters who can be used for DCA hunting.

5.8 Any contraventions must be reported to CapeNature without delay and CapeNature will evaluate such reports for further action.

5.9 The DAU/AU will compile information (with photographic evidence where possible) within the area of jurisdiction with special reference to;

5.9.1 number of stock lost or injured or euthanized as a result of DCA's, the gender and age of such stock lost, as well as a cost estimate of said stock losses (Annexure 6);

5.9.2 the identification of the DCA responsible for the losses, the number and species of DCA hunted and the estimated age, gender, mass and stomach content (where possible) (Annexure 5); and where possible, the mapping (GPS position) of areas where stock losses took place, as well as locations where DCA's were successfully hunted.

5.10 Above-mentioned information must be submitted to CapeNature on a quarterly basis.

5.11 DAU/AU will decide which hunters may operate in their areas until the system of accredited hunters, as mentioned above, is implemented.

6. <u>Responsibilities of the private landowner (See Annexure 11)</u>

If a permit has already been issued to a DAU/AU and a private landowner, who is a member of said DAU/AU, wishes to make use of a person not registered as a hunter for the DAU/AU, the following procedure applies.

6.1 A private landowner who wishes to hunt on his own property, but is not listed as an accredited hunter on the DAU/AU's permit, must apply for a separate permit from CapeNature. This private landowner is responsible for the completion and full submission of the relevant application.

6.2 A Private landowner wishing to make use of a hunter not listed in the DAU/AU's permit must apply for a separate permit from CapeNature. This private landowner is responsible for the completion and full submission of the relevant application. The private landowner is also responsible for the provision of the necessary details of such additional hunter as part of a complete application.

6.3 A private landowner who is the holder of a permit in terms of this agreement is responsible for complying with the conditions of said permit. The private landowner is thus responsible for the compilation of data (as per data collection forms attached as Annexure 5–7) and the provision of such data to CapeNature.

Version 5.0 - Hoede Wead - Version 5.0

7. Duties of Permit Holder/Responsible Person (See Annexure 11)

The appointed responsible person has a duty to ensure that all DCA management within his DAU/AU takes place in accordance with all legal requirements and within the framework of this agreement. The responsible person therefore has a duty to apply for a permit to use prohibited hunting methods and to ensure that this permit is renewed timeously. The responsible person must also ensure that he applies for the most appropriate methods for his specific situation. The responsible person must ensure that applications must be complete at all times and all forms (Annexure 2 and 3) must be supplied.

7.1 All potential DCA's on the property must be identified, where practically possible, so that the appropriate management measure can be planned and implemented.

7.2 If stock losses occur, a comprehensive carcase evaluation must be done to ascertain the cause of death (e.g. stillborn, hypothermia, disease, caught by predator, secondary predation, etc.). All stock losses and the cause thereof must be carefully recorded. In the case of damage caused by bush pig, a cost estimate of damage to crops and property must be attached.

7.3 Management measures shall be implemented in accordance with this agreement and as authorised by the permit. The responsible person has a duty to ensure that the implementation and the use of management methods takes place in accordance with the permit. The responsible person is also responsible for the control of the relevant equipment.

7.4 The local SAPS and adjacent landowners must, where possible, be informed of all management actions, as well as where and when hunts will take place. This will ensure that the SAPS or CapeNature are not needlessly called out to respond to complaints of possible poaching or stock theft.

7.5 The permit holder must collect all the necessary data as agreed in this document and must supply this data to CapeNature in accordance with permit conditions. Renewal of permits is subject to the submission of said data.

8. Permit application procedures

8.1 Permits issued in terms of this agreement will be issued by CapeNature after receipt and evaluation of a comprehensively completed application. The validity period of each permit will be indicated on the relevant permit.

8.2 First Permit Application

The first application for a permit must contain the following information:

(i) the full names, address and ID no. of the landowner(s);

(ii) the name of the relevant property(ies);

(iii) the number of stock lost, injured or euthanized as a result of caracal or black-backed jackal predation, the gender and age of such stock lost, an estimated value of stock lost or crops damaged by bush pig, as well as photographic evidence of damage where possible;

(iv) the identification of the DCA responsible for the loss;

(v) methods currently employed to mitigate losses;

(vi) the planned management methods to be used;

(vii) preferred validity period of permit;

(viii) full names, addresses and ID no. of accredited persons who will perform the relevant management action;

(ix) in the case of a person other than the landowner, the written permission as per Annexure 3 must be completed for every additional person involved as referred to in paragraph 7.2(viii);

(x) in the case of more than one property or adjacent properties, the written

Version 5.0 - Nico de Waal - Version 5.0

permission as per Annexure 3 must be supplied for each additional property;

(xi) the information document (as per Annexure 4) must be completed and signed by the landowner (in the case of persons other than the landowner, each additional person must complete and sign the form); and

(xii) permits will be issued with a condition that all relevant data concerning DCA management must be collected.

(xiii) After expiry of said permit, the permit document must be returned to CapeNature within 30 days for record purposes, along with all relevant data collected (as per Annexures 5-7).

First applications for permits will be considered for the use of call-and-shoot, small stock protection collars, soft traps and "sniffer dogs". Such permits will be valid for a maximum period of one year.

8.3 Applications for renewal of permits

The renewal of a permit is subject to the holder's compliance with the permit conditions.

9. <u>Management measures that can be implemented without a permit</u>

Producers may manage caracal and black-backed jackal on their properties by means of cage traps or the hunting of these species during the day without a permit. In the case of bush pig, the producer may hunt bush pig throughout the year in accordance with the annual Hunting Notice. Such producer must, however, be in possession of a permit if he wishes to make use of hunting dogs as "sniffer" dogs or any other prohibited hunting method.

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation and management measures may be implemented without a permit.

9.1 Enclosures—

(i) kraal/corrall;
(ii) overnight shelters;
(iii) camps;
(iv) barriers; or
(v) predator-proof fencing;

9.2 collars—

(i) Deadstop collar;
(ii) King collar;
(iii) bell collar;
(iv) cell phone collar;
(v) bell and scent collar;
(vi) any other sheep protective collar; or
(vii) smart technology collar;

9.3 husbandry practices—

(i) shepherd or herder; or

(ii) stock protection animals, including but not limited to, guard dogs, alpacas, donkeys, ostriches or other wild animals;

9.4 deterrent or repellent methods —

(i) alarms;
(ii) bells;
(iii) scent;
(iv) lights; or
(v) noise;

9.5 husbandry practices, including but not limited to, seasonal lambing co-ordination, sheep race selection and diversification, stock rotation; or

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

9.6 Veldwagter movement sensor equipment.
9.7 Monitoring cameras and other similar equipment.

10. Management methods and applicable conditions

In terms of section 29 and 33 of the Ordinance, below-mentioned hunting methods are listed as prohibited hunting methods, and no wild animals may be hunted by means of these methods. In order to qualify for a permit to make use of such methods, a person must comply with the relevant conditions.

10.1 Call-and-shoot at night

Only persons who have attended an accredited course and provide proof of attendance.

Proof of attendance and competence must accompany the application.

Call-and-shoot operators must comply with the requirements of the Firearm Control Act.

The local SAPS as well as adjacent landowners must be informed prior to any hunt taking place. If a person other than the landowner wishes to implement a prohibited management action, he must be in possession of written permission from the landowner, in accordance with Annexure 3 as well as a permit to make use of said prohibited hunting methods.

10.2 Cage Traps

The prohibition on the use of cage traps is suspended in terms of the annual Hunting Notice, and may therefore be used without a permit, subject to the following conditions.

(i) A cage trap must, as far as possible, be set in shade.
(ii) A cage trap must be checked at least once every 24 hours.
(iii) Only approved cage traps may be used.
(iv) The trapdoor of cage traps that are not in use must be closed.
(v) Non-target animals must be released immediately; and
(vi) the target animal must be euthanized as quickly as possible once the animal is discovered in a cage trap.

The landowner must ensure that—

(i) the captured animal is not taunted or injured;
(ii) the captured animal is not exposed to the elements or other disturbances;
(iii) the captured animal is not exhibited;
(iv) the captured animal is not kept in a cage for longer than 24 hours; or
(v) the captured animal is not kept in captivity without a permit, unless under veterinary care.

Cage traps must comply with the following minimum requirements —

(i) The cage trap must be species specific.
(ii) The frame of the cage trap must be covered with meshed material to prevent the escape of the captured animal.
(iii) The trapdoor of the cage trap must be fitted with a locking mechanism to prevent the escape of the captured animal.
(iv) There may be no sharp edges or wires on the inside of the cage.
(v) The frame of the trapdoor must be fitted with a stopper mechanism to prevent the door from falling out when the cage is picked up.
(vi) The cage trap must be equipped with handles so that the cage can be easily moved and carried.

10.3 Approved leghold devices ("soft trap")

Only the "soft trap" type leghold devices, as described in the draft Norms and Standards may be used. The use of any other leghold device is illegal.

Soft traps may be used in conjunction with call-and-shoot and small stock protection collars.

Version 5.0 PIO de Waal - Version 5.0

Soft traps must carry clear identification that identifies the owner of the soft trap in order to be able to follow up any contraventions.

In order to qualify for the use of soft traps, the applicant must show that he has attended approved training. Soft Traps may only be used in conjunction with bait/scent that lures the individual DCA to the soft trap and may not be set in the following locations, as per the current draft Norms and Standards, as mentioned above.

(i) in any footpath, road or track
(ii) in or near holes in fencelines
(iii) directly alongside fencelines
(iv) within 100m of any watering point or borehole
(v) at any carcase other than that killed by the individual DCA
(vi) in front of any den or shelter
(vii) near natural prey killed by predators
(viii) in an area where endangered wild animals occur.

A soft trap must comply with the following minimum requirements:

(i) the size and type of soft trap must be target specific and selective towards trapping the individual DCA;
(ii) the soft trap must have a screw capable of adjusting the tension of the pan, which must be set to at least 1.75kg in order to prevent the capture of non-target animals smaller than a caracal or a black-backed jackal;
(iii) there must be a space of at least 5mm between the jaws of the soft trap when the jaws are closed;
(iv) the chain that connects the soft trap to the drag iron must have two swivels and a steel spring to act as a shock absorber in order to minimise injury;
(v) the chain must be attached to the centre of the underside of the soft trap; and
(vi) the jaws of the soft trap may not be serrated or toothed, and must be covered with rubber or some similar material that will minimise injury to the captured animal.

10.4 Hunting Dogs (sniffer dogs")

The use of hunting dogs will only be allowed in extraordinary circumstances where the implementation of other management methods has proven to be impractical. Hunting dogs must carry clear identification that identifies the owner of the dog in order to be able to follow up contraventions. Permits for the use of hunting dogs will only be considered if the applicant has complied with the following conditions —

(i) Every owner of hunting dogs, as well as every dog handler, must have attended approved training;
(ii) Every hunting dog must be micro-chipped and the number of the microchip, together with a photograph of each dog and the breed of the dog must accompany the permit application;
(iii) Every hunting dog must be examined by a veterinarian at least once a year, and a certificate of health must be issued. The certificate must accompany the permit application;
(iv) Only a maximum of six trained hunting dogs may take part in a hunt, but a maximum of twelve hunting dogs may be present at a hunt in order to allow for the training of the younger dogs;
(v) Physical contact between the hunting dogs and the DCA must be avoided as far as possible.

10.5 Small stock protection collars

Permit for the use of small stock protection collars will only be considered if the applicant has complied with the following—Every permit holder must have attended approved training;

(i) Only approved small stock protection collars may be used;

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

(ii) Warning notices must be placed at every entrance point to the property where small stock protection collars are applied for as long as the collars are in use;
(iii) the carcase of any animal killed by these collars, as well as the carcase of the prey animal that did not survive the attack must be removed immediately and incinerated, buried or destroyed;
(iv) any contaminated wool or hairs of any prey animal that has been equipped with a small stock protection collar and survived an attack must be sheared immediately and destroyed or buried;
(v) When small stock protection collars are not in use, they must be stored in a secure location where unauthorised persons cannot gain access to the collars.

Only sodium monofluoroacetate (Compound 1080) may be used in small stock protection collars. This provision is proclaimed in Regulation No. R. 1488 of Government Gazette No. 18412 on 14 November 1997 in accordance with the Hazardous Substances Act, No. 15 van 1973.

The carcase of any animals killed during the use of small stock protection collars must be buried at least 1 meter and covered with lime.

10.6 Hunting by means of Helicopter (Annexure 7)

This management method may only take place on an experimental basis for the purpose of research. This experiment will take place in a predetermined area. All data of stock losses and management methods implemented in the applicable area will be used to determine the experimental area. This process must form part of a registered research project under the auspices of a tertiary institution. The terms of reference for this project must be submitted to CapeNature for comment. A dedicated person must be present at all hunts to collect the necessary data.

Applications for the use of helicopter must also contain the following information:
(i) the helicopter's registration number;
(ii) the personal details of the pilot;
(iii) the details of the hunter; and
(iv) the pilot's pilot license.

Permits that are issued for the use of helicopters will also be subject to the following conditions:
(i) All adjacent landowners, as well as the local SAPS and conservation office, must be informed prior to the launch of any control operation.

11. Collection of data (Annexures 8, 9 & 10)

a. Data of confirmed DCA losses.
i. Date of loss
ii. Type of animal (goat, sheep, etc.)/type of crop
iii. Lamb or adult
iv. Male or female
v. Gravid (pregnant)(or not)
vi. Number of prey animals killed/percentage of crop damaged
vii. DCA responsible for losses
viii. Photo showing DCA feeding pattern/damage
ix. GPS coordinates (where available)

11.1 Data – Hunting statistics
(i) Date of hunt
(ii) Name of hunter
(iii) Property name
(iv) Hunting method employed
(v) DCA killed
(vi) Number

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

(vii) Male or female
(viii) Estimated age (adult, old, young)
(ix) Gravid (if gravid, state number of foetuses)
(x) Mass
(xi) Stomach content
(xii) GPS coordinates of hunt location (where available)
(xiii) Photo of DCA

Detailed statistics of non-target animals captured/killed must also be supplied.

Annexure 1

Principles for the effective management of DCA's

a) The origin of the damage must be understood.
b) The correct attitude must be maintained towards the animal responsible for the damage, and the management thereof.
c) The damage must be thoroughly evaluated.
d) The correct mitigation measures must be implemented to prevent or minimise damage.
e) Mitigation measures must be fair and cost-effective.
f) The management of DCA's must focus on the reduction or prevention of damage and not on the local extinction of the relevant species.
g) The application of adaptive management and animal husbandry to reduce or prevent damage.
h) After the application of mitigation measures, selective management methods can be implemented to remove the specific individual responsible for the damage from the system.

Correct approach to Damage Causing Wild Animals

a) What animal is responsible for the damage?
b) How much damage can be ascribed to this individual?
c) In which areas of the property does the most damage occur?
d) During which season or growth phase does the most damage occur?
e) Which mitigation measures can be implemented to prevent or reduce damage?
f) Are the proposed management methods ecologically acceptable and legal in terms of applicable legislation?
g) Are the proposed management methods humane and ethically acceptable?'

Following this bold step taken by CapeNature and the PMF in the Western Cape Province, the eight other provinces in South Africa did not enter into comparable agreements of co-operative predation management.

Recent studies by Gunter (2008), Strauss (2009) and Van Niekerk (2010) highlighted the paucity of scientific and popular publications regarding predation, predation management as well as human-predator conflict management in South Africa. Recognising this major gap in scientific information, these topics were reviewed by Du Plessis (2013)[867]; excerpts from the abstract of the study are quoted below:

"South Africa has a long history of human-wildlife conflict with black-backed jackal Canis mesomelas and caracal Caracal caracal, especially in the small livestock industry. Recently, wildlife ranchers and cattle farmers have also started to report losses. Despite

[867] Du Plessis, Johannes Jurie, 2013. Towards the development of a sustainable management strategy for *Canis mesomelas* and *Caracal caracal* on rangeland. Ph.D. thesis. University of the Free State, Bloemfontein, South Africa.

Version 5.0 – Rudi de Waal – Version 5.0

the excessive losses and widespread efforts to curb these conflicts there is no sustainable human predator conflict management (HPCM) strategy in place. Livestock owners still tackle the challenges individually or in small groups and concentrate mostly on elimination and precautionary techniques. Blanket-control and poisoning practices in many areas results in biodiversity being under constant threat, while stock losses do not decline.

Current knowledge on aspects relating to black-backed jackal and caracal in South Africa (including ecology, economics, management techniques, predation rates, sociology) was collated and evaluated. Such information is needed for the development of a sustainable HPCM strategy for damage-causing black-backed jackal and caracal on livestock farms and wildlife ranches, and to inform policy and decision-making related to these species.

There is a general lack of scientific information on virtually all the identified aspects, limiting the development of management strategies. Specific information gaps with regards to each aspect were identified and a conceptual model presented for the development of a sustainable HPCM plan for damage-causing black-backed jackal and caracal on rangeland in South Africa.

Most of the available ecological research on black-backed jackal and caracal are from spatially and temporally isolated studies, limited in scope, confined to protected areas and not focused on the development of sustainable management strategies. This results in a limited understanding of the ecological role of both black-backed jackal and caracal in South African ecosystems. A prerequisite for sustainable HPCM programs is a sound ecological understanding of the animals that are to be managed, and the ecosystems in which they operate. Without such an understanding it is difficult to predict the contribution of different management interventions to mitigate damage and the effects on the behaviour and ecology of target animals.

The study has also highlighted the overall lack of scientific estimations on the economics of black-backed jackal and caracal predation, and HPCM operations. Isolated pieces of evidence confirm that the current associated costs are high. A range of benefits and costs associated with these two species, which have not yet been quantified, are also emphasized. With reference to the human dimension there is insufficient information to understand the diversity of perceptions which various stakeholders may hold towards black-backed jackal, caracal and associated HPCM actions. Understanding these perceptions and its drivers are most important for the drafting of a sustainable HPCM strategy.

Further, scientific information on HPCM methods for black-backed jackal and caracal in South Africa is lacking. Most information on these methods is contained in popular literature and very few refer specifically to the management of damage-causing black-backed jackal or caracal. A number of information gaps have been identified regarding the effectiveness of available HPCM methods to curb black-backed jackal and caracal predation under different South African conditions.

Some major shortcomings have been identified in the availability of current predation information. The small number of available sources on livestock and wildlife predation is limiting an understanding of specifically black-backed jackal or caracal predation patterns. Better qualitative information on livestock and wildlife predation is needed to substantiate reported losses, and provide grounds for HPCM decisions. Moreover, it could also be used to better understand the dynamics of the predation which is necessary to develop sustainable HPCM strategies."

Du Plessis (2013) then concluded:

"*Future research should be directed, coordinated and conducted systematically to ensure that the understanding of these damage-causing species is complemented and*

Version 5.0 – HO de Vaal – Version 5.0

priority knowledge gaps filled in a focused way. Setting short and long-term goals is important, as well as the continuous feedback between participating scientists, livestock farmers, wildlife ranchers, conservation managers, legislation officials, the coordinator(s) and the public."

The annual meeting of the PMF was held on Wednesday 28 August 2013 in the Board Room of the Landbougebou at the UFS in Bloemfontein. Translated excerpts of the draft minutes are quoted below:

"*Present: **NWGA** - Harry Prinsloo (Chairman), Leon de Beer (CEO), Louis du Pisani (Nat. Manager: Production Advice and Development), Billy van Zyl (Eastern Cape), Juan Venter (Eastern Cape Production Adviser), Thys Delport (Western Cape), Abraham Landman (Western Cape Production Adviser), Schalk Jacobs (Free State), Jan Louis Venter (Free State Production Adviser), Bom Louw (Southern Free State and KwaZulu-Natal Production Adviser), Machiel Odendaal (Mpumalanga), **SA Mohair Growers' Assoc**. - Coligny Stegmann, **RPO** - Lardus van Zyl (Large Stock Industry), Gerhard Schutte (CEO and Small Stock Industry), Nic Zaayman (Free State), Corinne van Rensburg (Northern Cape), Koning Scholtz (Northern Cape), Ernest Pringle (Eastern Cape), Jacques Swanepoel (North West), **Wildlife Ranching SA** - Dr. Gert Dry, **ALPRU** - HO de Waal, **Researcher** - Neil Viljoen, **Scientist** - Thys de Wet, **Scientist Dept. Agric. Free State** - Andries Strauss, **Environmental Affairs** - Thomas Mbedzi (DEA), Wessel Jacobs (Northern Cape), Hannes Blom (Free State), Lourens Goosen (Free State), **Free State Hunters and Conservation Association** - Daan Bodenstein, **Cape Wools SA** - Dalena White and **Griffon Poison Information Centre** - Gerhard Verdoorn. Apologies: Michau Muller (Northern Cape, NWGA), Hendrik Botha (KwaZulu-Natal NWGA and RPO), John Durr (Western Cape, RPO), Frikkie Wentzel (Eastern Cape, RPO), Justin Coetzee (SAMGA), Herman Barnard (WRSA), Jaco van Deventer (CapeNature), Tim de Jongh (Eastern Cape Environmental Affairs), Magdel Boshoff (DEA) and Bonita Francis (PMF Secretariat). Absent, no apology received: Koos Davel (Mpumalanga, RPO), Dr. Julian Jaftha (DAFF), Sam Makhubele (Limpopo Environmental Affairs), Graham Keet (KwaZulu-Natal Environmental Affairs) and Gavin Lipjes (Sub-Saharan Hounds men Assoc.).*

1. OPENING and WELCOME

The Chairman, Mr. Harry Prinsloo opened the meeting and welcomed all, especially Gerhard Verdoorn and Gert Dry.

4. MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

The minutes of the meeting which was held on 30 August 2012 at the Jakkalsdraai Conference Facility was approved (proposed: Mr. Jacques Swanepoel and seconded: Mr. Coligny Stegmann) with the following changes:

Pp. 3 4.2 Norms & Standards

*On the question by Hannes Blom... – 'om dit nou te implementeer is **voortydig** en nie vroegtydig…'*

Pp. 4 'Bespreking rondom slagyster veldtog

*Point no. 2 - Alle gif is verband behalwe 1080 vir gebruik saam met die **gifhalsband** ipv gifskieter.'*

Pp. 7 6.1 Report on progress: RMRDSA

*Mr. Coligny Stegmann enquired about the **R500 000** instead of R50 000 …'*

5. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

5.1 Foothold trap campaign

5.1.1 Use of M44 instead of Coyote "getter"

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

Lourens Goosen explained that is not about the device but to retain the device as a legal control method. It must be part of the "toolbox" which is available to farmers. Therefore the poison ejector must be included in the Norms and Standards as a legal control method. He has written a justification and provided it to Magdel Boshoff.

5.1.2 Killer traps ("Omslag slagysters) in cooperations[868]

There are two viewpoints regarding killer traps ("omslag/nek slagysters"), namely: (1) Official letters send to cooperations to remove these devices from their stores and replace it with approved and acceptable devices; and (2) To regulate the devices with permits and to provide the necessary training to persons in its use.

5.2 Feedback on the status of the "DCA Norms & Standards"

Thomas Mbedzi explained the status of the Norms & Standards and DEA's cooperation and relation in the process with DAFF.

The Chairman requested Thomas to convey a very strong message to his Department in which the PMF express its dissatisfaction with the delay in the process the past four years and their indifference with farmers and the industry. Furthermore, the inability of DAFF to accept their responsibility regarding food security was noted and that the process cannot advance if they are not present at meetings.

Decision: The PMF Executive must urgently arrange an appointment with the DG of DAFF to discuss the following: (1) DAFF's lack of involvement at PMF meetings; (2) Delays with the process of the N&S and TOPS regulations; (3) Role and accepting of its responsibility for food security in South Africa; (4) Implementing of a system of coordinated predation management; and (5) Toolbox with control methods to be used by farmers.

5.3 Feedback regarding funding for predation

Thomas Mbedzi reported. Mr. Leon de Beer explained that the NWGA is a member of PMF and is a registered service provider with DAFF, therefore funds can flow into the NWGA account and the money will be made available to research programmes.

Dr. Gert Dry explained that the process with DEA is a production orientated process and is different and more difficult than DAFF. We will have to develop a proposal for approval by the DG, they will ask for tenders for research and it will be managed by DEA.

Mr. Leon de Beer was of the opinion that a meeting be called with DEA to explain that the structure of the RMRD was also based on the requirement of tenders.

Decision: There is merit in also meeting with the DG for DEA.

5.4 ***Training: Free State Hunters Association***

Mr. Daan Bodenstein reported on the service which they provide regarding night shooting and the training involved. It is one of the "tools in the toolbox" which can be used with great success. A course on foothold traps will also be presented. Mr. Lourens Goosen advised members of the forum that a competency certificate issued by the Free State Environmental Affairs and a permit is needed before a person may set foothold traps on the property of somebody else.

Foothold traps ("Slagysters") (1) Discussions were held regarding the drafting of SABS standards and certain methods of Best Practices and to consider approaching the SABS to write a code for foothold traps; (2) the American model describes the specifications – it only needs compliance; (3) "Norms and Standards" specifically provide specifications for footholds traps. ISO 9000 standard is included in the N&S; and (4) refer to foothold traps and cage traps ("vangysters en vanghokke") and not to gin traps ("slagysters") – "you need to change the mind set".

[868] Editor's Note: should read cooperatives (commercial entities, namely Agricultural Cooperatives).

Version 5.0 - Pro de Waal

In summary: (1) The message must be heard loud and clear that good cooperation exist in the Free State between the Professional Hunters Association and Free State Environmental Affairs regarding the successful use of certain control methods and training to use it. Members must develop cooperation in provinces and refer to the successes in the Free State; and (2) training for foothold traps is an absolute priority. A curriculum or model must be developed for use by all concerned and departments. Free State Environmental Affairs has a curriculum presented over three days but it is difficult to get farmers involved.

Decision: (1) Curriculum/model for foothold traps must be developed. (a) Practice used by Neil Viljoen is acceptable; (b) Free State Environmental Affairs has a curriculum in place; and (c) Norms and Standards must be considered. Because no system is yet approved the unofficial version must be used until the standards have been finalised; and (2) Must be circulated to training institutions as the official curriculum for foothold traps.

Action: Niel Viljoen/Louis du Pisani/Lourens Goosen.

6. MATTERS FOR DISCUSSION

6.1 DVD – "the good story"

The Chairman reported regarding discussions with Prof. Mohammad Karaan on poor communication with political decision makers and the advice to improve it: (1) draft two page document to state the problem; (2) politicians who are farmers and understand the circumstances of farming may pick it up and possibly provide assistance; and (3) write to DAFF and draw attention to the fact that predation is impeding the national Development Plan.

The following communication tools were discussed to convey a dedicated and structured message: (1) Develop a DVD – "the good story". Eventually the DVD is intended for YouTube; (2) Training DVD of Niel Viljoen (4 languages); (3) Kyknet TV channel to telecast these two 2 videos; (4) recommendation of the PMF executive to engage a professional such as Erika Alberts of Agri Connect to advise regarding the design of a PMF website; and (5) use Dr. Gerhard Verdoorn to convey the message on behalf of farmers (be the face of the farmer).

Decision: (1) at the November meeting a structured communication plan will be tabled. Erika Alberts must be requested to present a proposal; and (2) the cost will be for the account of the four industries.

6.2 Reporting by provincial PMF

Reports were given by provincial representatives.

Decision: The meeting noted the good communication and cooperation between departments and that provincial PMF actions are driven actively.

6.3 Report back from provincial departments of Environment

Reports were given by provincial representatives.

6.4 Report – Protocol in Western Cape

Abraham Landman made a submission[869].

6.5 Code of Best Practice – Predator control

[869] This was in reference to the Memorandum to the two MEC's setting up the Co-operative Agreement between the Predator Management Forum (Western-Cape) and the Western Cape Nature Conservation Board trading as CapeNature and which was signed by the parties from 2-24 April 2013.

Version 5.0 – PDF Web Version

6.6 Code of Best Practice for wool sheep farming in SA

Juan Venter referred to the Code of Best Practice for Predation which combined the codes of all the industries.

6.7 Retail and predation

Dalena White, consultant employed by Cape Wools SA made presentation about the wool strategy of a retailer and their involvement with the wool farmer in their good business journey.

6.8 Assistance with fencing

Billy van Zyl referred to the initiative of a broker to sell wire mesh (sifdraad) for predation management at cost price to farmers.

Decision: Engage with the company to extend the deadline of the offer.

7. RESEARCH PROJECTS

6.1 RMRD SA Predation proposals

Gerhard Schutte briefly explained the structure of RMRD SA. An amount of R1 million was realised from DAFF which will be used to fund for requests for research. The RMRD considered the following requests to fund predation research:

Project	Researcher	Amount approved	Comments by RMRD SA and PMF Steering Committee
Scientific Assessment	Prof. Graham Kerley	R250 000	Request RMRDSA to determine merit of the project with the mandate to scale the project up.
Jackal ecology on reserves and farms	Prof. Graham Kerley	R80 000	No comments – approved.
Guard animals for predator control	Prof. Gareth Bath	R57 500	Request that the results of the study be incorporated in the Scientific Assessment.
CSSR Koup Predator Project	Prof. Beatrice Conradie	R109 000	Request was much higher - only R109 000 was approved.
Forensic predation investigation	Dr. Johan Steyl	R25 000	Wil only conduct a literature study.
Impact of predation on wildlife	Prof. HO de Waal	R150 000 in principle	Serious questions regarding methodology. Researcher must justify why the technique and methodology used for sheep and cattle are not necessarily applicable to wildlife.
Institutional memory for predation management	Prof. HO de Waal		Researchers of Scientific Assessment and the project must meet and submit a project proposal. It is possible to increase the request of R250 000 for the project.
Predator DNA identification	Dr. Cindy Harper		Was not allocated.

The requests for projects amounted to about R670 000 (excluding VAT) and other costs. This was a reactive process and the PMF Executive has the following proactive recommendations: (1) develop a PMF website - R60 000 was allocated; (2) calculation of predator population sizes – researcher to be identified; and (3) continue extension actions of Niel Viljoen training – R150 000 was allocated.

In addition to the R1 million from DAFF, the Red Meat Industry has also spent R300 000 on current projects.

Decision: The PMF Executive has signed off on these projects.

6.2 Predator training

Niel Viljoen presented a short report on his predator training programme from 2008 – 2013. The Chairman reiterated the importance of convincing people of the success of predation management with certain control methods (toolbox) with limited resources from government.

Mr. Lardus van Zyl referred to losses for cattle which may be twice as much as those for sheep because sheep farmers are more skilled; traditionally they have applied control

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

methods over many years: (1) use of poison remains a big problem and must be removed from the system and replaced by training and knowledge about acceptable practices; (2) focus is right – need persons to conduct training and obtain funding of the training; (3) farmers will have to start looking for their own funding and rely less on the government for assistance; (4) he was of the opinion a coordinated predation management system (where government is taking responsibility) must be the focus and the DG must be informed accordingly; and (5) consider the option of a statuary levy in the longer term.

Mr. Ernest Pringle referred to the two sources of funding, namely the government who is sitting with money originating from levies from producers and the position of being self-funded by instituting a voluntary predator levy on the sale of all wool-, mohair- and red meat cheques. If drastic measures were not taken, the small stock farmer would stop farming in the next 10 – 15 years.

Mr. Lardus van Zyl referred again to the implementing of a statuary levy and fact that the capacity and knowledge exist in the PMF. It is time to confront farmers with the option that about R15 – R20 million per year is needed to address the problem successfully. He suggested that a very solid plan is drawn up with a cost estimate and sold to farmers.

Mr. Billy van Zyl requested that the possibility of for example a land tax is investigated, an extra 2c/ha can be deducted and channelled to a predation fund – such a system will benefit all farmers.

Decision: A team of experts (PMF members) must draft a plan (names of Niel Viljoen, Gerhard Verdoorn, Leon de Beer and Gerhard Schutte were mentioned).

6.3 Assessment of Botha + Conradie reports

Meeting took note of these reports.

6.4 Poison ejector and snares

Mr. Coligny Stegmann referred to the 2 control methods in the "toolbox" which can be used very successful and cause very little injuries.

Mr. Lardus van Zyl proposed that research be conducted to determine the effect of snares on certain animal species and how it can be used effectively in South Africa.

Decision: Niel Viljoen must contact the researcher at UCT and also talk to Coligny Stegmann and HO de Waal."

2014

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter MAY 2014[870]:

"*The Predation Management Forum (PMF) is proud to announce the launch of a predation management website on Wednesday. This website has been designed to provide a wide spectrum of information relating to those predators who cause so much damage to livestock farmers. The website aims to further provide guidelines and advice to producers to manage predation in the most humane and environmentaly sustainable manner, i.e. guide producers to integrated management.*

We urge all agriculture industry stakeholders to visit http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Stakeholders are also invited to share information and photographs with the editorial team. Please e-mail Bonita Francis: nwga@nwga.co.za"

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter MAY 2014[871]:

"***Scientific assessment no. 1 priority for all livestock industries***

At the most recent meeting of the Predation Management Forum (PMF), all industries involved reiterated the importance of a scientific assessment (SA), considering that

[870] PMF Newsletter MAY 2014; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[871] PMF Newsletter MAY 2014; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

predation losses are the most critical to all the industries, including wool, red meat, mohair and wildlife. DEA and DAFF have made funds available for the SA. The wool industry is also contributing towards the assessment over two years. The rest of the industries indicated that should the project leader approach them, they would consider contributing to the assessment. The assessment will commence as soon as all the funding has been secured.

In the meantime, the process of the norms and standards has been placed on hold in anticipation of the out-come of the scientific assessment, which may affect the legislative measures that DEA will impose. Another aspect is the collaboration between DEA and DAFF, which needs to be finalised in the areas of training and certification of courses, which are on the board of DAFF."

On 13 May 2014, Prof. HO de Waal gave a presentation[872] on coordinated predation management at meeting of a national hunting association at the A Lodge, Bloemfontein, Free State Province.

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMF Newsletter JUNE 2014[873]:

- **Monitor farm now also in the Overberg**
- Farmers in the Overberg increasingly experience problems with predators, mainly caracals, but jackals are also moving into the area.
- To start a monitor farm in the Bredasdorp area and study predator, Niël Viljoen a predator specialist and farmer from Loxton, recently visited the area. He aimed to collect data on predator activities and monitor the effects of a predation management programme.
- Pieter Albertyn of the farm Zeekoeivlei agreed to participate in monitoring programme of Niël Viljoen. In the management programme, Pieter Albertyn will keep record of the livestock losses and the number of predators killed.
- Niël Viljoen is available for advice and visit monitor farms at least twice a year to collect data and assist the farmers. He will also assist with the training of Pieter Albertyn's staff.
- Full article appeared in the Wolboer, Vol 2 – No 2 of 2014.

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter JUNE 2014[874]:

*"**Specialists learn more about humane traps***

Predator experts Niel Viljoen and Thys de Wet were sponsored by the PMF to attend an international trapping course in Hoedspruit in April this year. The course leader was Albert Roura from Spain who is the president of the Union of European Trappers Associations (UETA).

There is a strong global movement towards the use of more humane traps as they are certified under the Agreement on International Humane Trapping Standards (AIHTS). The AIHTS was developed between Northern Hemisphere countries for trapping fur animals; however, the current version includes damage-causing animals.

These traps were also introduced to the PMF group who visited the USA on a fact-finding mission during 2012.

The course focused mainly on the newly introduced Colarum, a "neckhold" snare with a stopper on the cable to prevent suffocation, and Belisle, a "foothold" snare. Both of

[872] De Waal, HO, 2014. Recent advances in developing a system of coordinated predation management in South Africa. Informed by interacting with the USDA-APHIS Wildlife Services and other role players in Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Arizona and Texas from 17-28 May 2010 … and developments since. SA Jagtersvereniging. 13 Mei 2014. A Lodge, Bloemfontein, Suid-Afrika.
[873] PMF Newsletter JUNE 2014; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[874] PMF Newsletter JUNE 2014; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

these traps have been tested extensively on wolves, foxes, lynxes and feral dogs in the USA and Europe.

Since it has only recently been introduced to South Africa, only time will tell whether these traps will work for South African circumstances and especially for clever predators such as black-back jackal and caracal."

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter JULY 2014[875]:

"Predation research

The following predation research has been evaluated and recommended by Red Meat Research and Development SA and are being funded by the Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (DAFF). Over the next few months, each project will be highlighted describing the aims and methodology.

1. Scientific assessment - Prof Graham Kerley from the Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University (NMMU) will undertake a scientific assessment of the predator problem, taking into account the problems and needs of the stock industry, as well as environmental (ecological) requirements.

2. Jackal ecology on reserves and farms - This project will look at the ecology and population dynamics of the black-backed jackal on reserves and farms. Prof Graham Kerley, NMMU, will conduct the research.

3. Guard animals for predator control - Prof Gareth Bath and his team will undertake a survey of farmers' experience with guard animals to control the impact of predators on livestock.

4. CSSIR Koup predator project - Prof Beatrice Conradie will make an integrated landscape level assessment of the financial and biological impact of predators on livestock farmers in the Central Karoo.

5. Management of problem-causing animals - A training course has been developed and monitor/training farms have been set up within different ecological regions. The research is being conducted by Niel Viljoen in collaboration with NWGA production advisors."

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMF Newsletter JULY 2014[876]:

- **Electric fences help to curb predation losses (by Niël Viljoen)**
- The use of electric fences on a monitor farm in the Free State reduced predation losses from 6% in 2010 to 1,5% in 2013.
- The use of deadly control methods was the only option on the farm for many years, but using these methods was time consuming and conflicted with farming activities and currently only used seldom.
- Farms in the Free State are relatively small; therefore, the territories of black-backed jackals may include several farms. Not everyone was spending sufficient time and effort to prevent predation; therefore, it was decided to isolate the farms with jackal proof or electric fences.
- The owner decided to use electric fences and erected it over time as finances allowed. The lambing camps were isolated first and enclosing of the rest of the farm is making progress annually.
- It is important to keep the area the electric fence free of plant material, because veld fires are a real threat for such an expensive structure. Maintenance of the electric fence is equally important.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

[875] PMF Newsletter JULY 2014; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[876] PMF Newsletter JULY 2014; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

- The clearing of the areas on both sides of the fence and the maintenance of the fences require much less time than other control methods, thus the farmer has more time to concentrate on the other farming activities.

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter JULY 2014[877]:

> ***"Looking for game farmers with leopard problems***
>
> *Journalist Richard Conniff is writing an article for National Geographic and would like to interview farmers who run high-value game farms but experience problems with leopards. He will be arriving in South Africa on 23 July 2014 and will be travelling to the Kruger Park, Limpopo and North West from 27 July to 6 August. Farmers who can assist, can contact Richard via e-mail at richard.conniff@gmail.com."*

The study by Van Niekerk (2010) focused on predation losses of sheep and goats in five provinces. A next study by Badenhorst (2014) followed along similar lines and studied the impact of predation on cattle farms in seven provinces[878]. Excerpts of the abstract are quoted below:

> *"A number of studies have focused on the cost of predation on small livestock, specifically the direct cost of predation, and a few studies have looked at the different methods to help farmers to minimise or eliminate losses due to predation. However, no countrywide study has been done to quantify the direct, as well as the indirect, cost of predation on large livestock in South Africa.*
>
> *This report has three main objectives that include: to quantify the direct and indirect losses due to predation; to determine the impact of predation on the large livestock industry in the North West province; to investigate the underlying structures in the predation prevention practices used by farmers in the North West province; to improve the understanding of the current behaviour of the farmers in preventing predation and to investigate the factors that influence predation in the North West province, in order to identify prevention approaches that are associated with reduced predation. Such information may contribute to the identification of possible best management practices for predation prevention.*
>
> *This report was part of a larger study that included seven provinces in South Africa, but for the purpose of this report only the North West province is explored in detail and the rest of those data were included in the appendix. The study was conducted in the four magisterial districts of the North West province namely: Bojanala Platinum District, Bophirima District, Ngaka Modiri Molema District and Southern District. The sample size of the study was 238 respondents and a combined total of 122 780 head of cattle or 16% of the total cattle in the North West province. Telephonic interviews were used to collect data from the farmers. The questionnaire included questions on socio-economic factors, managerial factors and the methods that farmers are using to protect their livestock.*
>
> *The majority of the losses in the four magisterial districts of the North West province were caused by the black-backed jackal followed by the caracal. The percentage of losses due to the caracal is significantly lower than those caused by the black-backed jackal. The reason for the lower predation is not clear, but it is speculated that it is because of the smaller population of the caracal and also the fact that caracal are lone predators and do not hunt in groups.*
>
> *The direct cost of predation in the North West province was estimated at ZAR 67 776 800, when extrapolating predation losses on a provincial basis. The indirect cost of predation in the North West province was divided into lethal and non-lethal cost. The lethal cost of predation was estimated at ZAR 7 455 333 and the non-lethal cost was*

[877] PMF Newsletter JULY 2014; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

[878] Badenhorst, Coenraad Geldenhuys, 2014. The economic cost of large stock predation in the North West Province of South Africa. M.Sc. Agric. dissertation. University of the Free State, Bloemfontein, South Africa.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

ZAR 9 087 653. Therefore, the total cost of predation in the North West province was estimated at ZAR 84 319 786.

This study showed that 37% of farmers use lethal control methods and only 14% use non-lethal methods of control. The lethal preventing methods are divided into six types of methods that include: shooting predators at night with spotlights (15%), using specialist hunters (6%), foothold traps (1%), cage traps (8%), hunting with dogs (2%) and poison (5%). The non-lethal methods are: herdsmen (8%), electric fences (1%), jackal- proof fences (<1%), kraaling (4%) and guarding dogs (1%).

The data were used to investigate the underlying structures and also to identify the best management practices. The principal component regression (PCR) tools were used to analyse the data and deal with the problem of multi-co-linearity. The Pairwise Granger Causality test was used to analyse the direction of causality. The study included 42 different explanatory variables that were divided into four groups namely: socio-economic factors, managerial factors, lethal control methods and non-lethal control methods. There were 11 significant variables in the PCR (Logit) and 22 significant variables in the PCR (Truncated). The causality tests showed that none of the Logit variables had a Granger cause, but there were two Tobit variables that had a Granger cause. These two lethal methods had a negative effect on the level of predation. These results were unexpected, but this effect may be because of inexperienced farmers who kill predators that do not cause problems thereby causing a "vacuum" effect."

Badenhorst (2014) then concluded:

"*The information that was collected in this study confirms that predation has a major effect on the livestock sector and that a solution should be found to reduce predation. This study also confirms the findings of Van Niekerk (2010), which showed that the factors that affect the occurrence of predation and those factors that affect the level of predation differ. This shows that there is no easy solution to the problem of predation and that farmers should decide on which factor they want to improve and pursue it. This study does not provide all the answers to predation, but it helps farmers and researchers understand predation better and to pursue the problems further.*"

The PMF meeting was held on 28 August 2014 in the Board Room Landbougebou, UFS in Bloemfontein. Excerpts of the minutes are quoted below:

*"<u>Present</u>: **NWGA** - Harry Prinsloo (Chairman), Leon de Beer (General Manager), Louis du Pisani (Nat. Manager: Production Advice and Development), Casper Labuschagne (Eastern Cape), Thys Delport (Western Cape), Jan Louis Venter (Free State Production Advisor), **SA Mohair Growers' Assoc**. - Coligny Stegmann, Kobus de Klerk, **RPO** - Lardus van Zyl (Large Stock Industry), Gerhard Schutte (Small Stock Industry), Nic Zaayman (Free State), Dries Enslin (Northern Cape), SP Fourie (North West), **ALRRU** - HO de Waal, **Researcher** - Neil Viljoen, **Scientist** - Thys de Wet, **Environmental Affairs** - Magdel Boshoff (DEA), Wessel Jacobs (Northern Cape), Lourens Goosen (Free State), Tim de Jongh (Eastern Cape), **DAFF** - Keith Ramsay, **Free State Hunters** - Daan Bodenstein, Poena van der Walt, **Griffon Poison Information Centre** - Gerhard Verdoorn and **PMF Secretariat** - Bonita Francis. <u>Apologies</u>: Michau Muller (Northern Cape NWGA), Herman Barnard (WRSA), Machiel Odendaal (Mpumalanga NWGA), Mandla Lukhele (DAFF), Schalk Jacobs (Free State NWGA), Thomas Mbedzi (DEA), Hendrik Botha (KZN NWGA + RPO), Koning Scholtz (Northern Cape RPO), Frikkie Wentzel (Eastern Cape RPO), Ernst Pringle (Eastern Cape RPO), Jaco van Deventer (Cape Nature), Graham Keet (KZN Environment), Hannes Blom (FS Environment) and Prof. Graham Kerley (NMMU). <u>Absent – no apology received</u>: Koos Davel (Mpumalanga RPO), John Durr (Western Cape RPO), Sam*

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

Makhubele (Limpopo Environmental Affairs) and Gavin Lipjes (Sub-Saharan Hounds men Assoc.).

3 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The Minutes of the previous meeting held on 28 August 2013 at the University of Free State, Bloemfontein were adopted on the proposal of Coligny Stegmann and seconded by HO de Waal, with the following changes:

Pg. 2 Point 3 – Notule vir goedkeuring "Bl. 4 Bespreking rondom slagyster veldtog… Alle gif is verban (en nie "verband")

Pg. 2 Point 4.1 – Slagyster veldtog 4.1.1 "Gebruik van M44 in plaas van Coyote (en nie Coyette) "getter"

4 MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

4.1 Feedback on the status of the DCA Norms and Standards and TOPS (arising)

The Chairman reported that Mr. Leon de Beer has been struggling since November 2013 to set up an appointment with the DG. However, a delegation consisting of NWGA and Grain SA members are meeting with the Deputy Minister for DAFF the next day.

Magdel reported that both N&S and TOPS processes will take another 2 years before implementation. Considering the issues by Woolworths and the code of best practice regarding gin traps (gin traps being one of the tools in N&S) and also considering the TOPS regulations, Magdel made a proposal that the process needs to be implemented sooner.

4.1.1 DEA – establishment of new research directorate

Magdel Boshoff reported on the new structure within their department, which has been established to look at research projects which will support legislation. The Scientific Assessment is currently the only project within directorate because it will influence the Norms and Standards.

Request from Gerhard Schutte to include DEA on the RMRD SA's subject working group to eliminate duplication of research. ***Gerhard Schutte and Magdel Boshoff to convene.***

Another request to invite Mr. Tino Herselman to Forum meetings/Steering committee meetings?

System of Coordinated Predation Management

HO de Waal briefly motivated the reasoning for a coordinated approach and said that SA has all the elements to implement predation management, but it is fragmented. The State does not have the capacity or expertise to deal with the situation and predation management should not be the responsibility of industry – they need to focus on the promotion of their product.

It is further very important to monitor and record losses and he envisages a HUB whereby all data will be captured and will be available to those who participate in the system. Payment for services (individually or collectively) will be necessary, but it is something to be finalised.

Coligny Stegmann prompted Mr. Keith Ramsay, DAFF to take note of how much money the government is losing in VAT every year due to predation. He estimated an amount of R7 billion lost to damages due to predators.

Gerhard Verdoorn said it is idealistic to ask government for financial assistance and cautioned members to not carry the wrong message to the ministry.

Both Tim de Jongh and Wessel Jacobs referred to the importance of technology and the absolute necessity for electronic permit system – all the data for permits and renewals are available, but there is no system to upload the data. Have been waiting for years to

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

obtain a permit system from national government. According to Wessel Jacobs, such a system exists and has been developed by a company in Bloemfontein. However, there is no money for implementation.

Wessel Jacobs informed meeting about electronic permit system in the Northern Cape which has been operational for 10 years now. System has been designed to eliminate human error. To always bear in mind that systems need to be designed around current legislation.

Toolbox of control methods

Niel Viljoen confirmed that all the tools currently in the toolbox are necessary for effective predation control. Thys de Wet referred to international trapping course they attended and to consider including new traps.

Tim de Jongh referred to many complaints about killer traps in the Eastern Cape, whereby Niel replied that in certain areas ONLY killer traps are reliable and should be used trained operators. One cannot remove killer traps from the tool box.

Lardus van Zyl is of the opinion that more methods should be included in tool box. He referred to the coyote getter, which should be included on a controlled and regulated basis.

Magdel Boshoff replied that the N&S relates to all species, but that different control methods are attached to TOPS regulations. Additional tools can be added, but it would be subjected to an extensive public process of consultation.

5 MATTERS FOR DISCUSSION

5.1 Communication strategy

The meeting discussed the functioning and format of the PMF website and monthly newsletters.

Concern was noted by Niel Viljoen that many farmers are not aware of the PMF and its functions. Need to get communication down to grassroots level.

The meeting took note of a decision taken by Steering Committee that Agri Connect will continue to maintain the website and monthly newsletter in conjunction with Bonita Francis, web administrator. This included the provision that Agri Connect can utilise the website for adverts to cover necessary running costs and not impose any further expenses to the PMF.

5.1.1 DVD – "The Good story"

Gerhard Verdoorn undertook to write a narrative portraying farmers to be the custodians of everything on the farm. He is however of the opinion that a DVD will be expensive and will not really focus on the target market. To rather approach his connections at broadcasting mediums such as 50/50, Projek Aardwolf and other who could possibly create a production on their own costs. Another channel to get message across is monthly articles in prominent publications. Daan Bodenstein has a connection for program "Wild en wragtig" and "Carte Blanche", as platform for green activists should also be investigated.

Dries Enslin, Northern Cape RPO commented that it is important that communication is multi dimensional because of the definition of different target groups. To not eliminate the production of a DVD, because there is most definitely a place in the market.

Decision: (1) The production of DVD is still on the cards; and (2) Gerhard Verdoorn undertook to write 2 different messages to different target groups, namely general public and farmers. To circulate content for comments before finalisation.

5.2 Report back from provincial PMF

East Cape – nothing to report

Version 5.0 - Hoos Waal - Version 5.0

Western Cape – issues relating to WC protocol being implemented in that helicopters are utilised for control. Bush pig problems in Southern Cape; request from Agri WC to include Baboons in the Scientific assessment due to increase in numbers; problem of wild dogs and the fact that the pound legislation has been lying with Minister for past 7 years for approval.

Free State – Jan Louis Venter reported on training courses by Niel Viljoen – very positive and monitor farms are operating with good results.

North West - SP Fourie, North West RPO said that they are not up to standard within the province, but are addressing the situation Stray dogs seem to be a far bigger problem than jackal. Lardus van Zyl commented that the absence of a NWGA production advisor in the province is the result of non-functioning.

National – the chairman briefly informed the meeting of the concept of subsidy on fencing to be discussed with Deputy Minister.

5.3 Report back from provincial department of Environment

East Cape: (1) Increase in numbers of baboons – request to hunt with helicopters; (2) Many sheep lost to brown hyena – also increase in numbers and the carcasses all looked similar. Provincial department not geared to cope with this, because they do not have trap cages – nobody wants to register on state system as input providers; and (3) Huge problem with damage causing control in old Transkei – cages are stolen; cannot do night hunting because there are too many people walking around; many of DCA's coming from forests; dogs being brought in to assist with control, are stolen for breeding material. All options have been exhausted and they are looking for new ideas.

Tim de Jongh seeks assistance from PMF to identify 2 areas within the Transkei to start discussions regarding predation control. Just so that government can see that they are busy with actions.

Louis du Pisani reported that 2 predation courses were held in the communal areas, but farmers were under the impression that Niel were coming to destroy the predators. Since then, no requests for courses were received. The problem is that in many cases it is the owner's own dogs who catch sheep. Trap cages are actually the only tool in tool box to be used in those areas. The solution to their problems lies within their own hands.

5.4 Framework for Best Practice for predation management in SA (arising)

Dr. Gerhard Verdoorn reported on the document and highlighted proposed changes. He wants clarification on: (1) Should the use of live bait for caracal be included or excluded. Do not want to tarnish the image of agriculture, therefore the question. Decision: 'Hou in dokument indien SPCA tevrede is'; and (2) The collection of specie specific bait needs attention. Animal zoo's etc. can assist with the collection of urine. The urine of cats who are shot can also be collected.

Decision:

Punt 2.2.1.4 - Die 2de sin moet verander of uitgelaat word. Dr. Verdoorn sal dit reg maak.

Punt 2.2.1.6 - Ligte, dr. Verdoorn sal dit bywerk

Punt 2.1.1 - Omheining moet selektief gedoen word (lamkampe) en nie die hele plaas nie.

Elektrifisering, 40mm te hoog vir jakkalse. Onderste draad naby aan grond, maar moet aarddraad wees.

Decision: (1) Proposals for change to be given to Dr. Verdoorn for consideration; and (2) Commentary to be received by end of September 2014.

5.5 International trapping course, 22 – 26 April 2014, Hoedspruit

Cognisance was taken of report by Niel Viljoen and Thys de Wet.

Version 5.0 - Hoop Vaal - Version 5.0

5.6 Alignment of training objectives of PMF and Hunters

The Chairman referred to meeting the previous day with Free State Hunters and the decision taken to accept the training courses ("roep & skiet", traps and national accredited instructor) as compiled by Niel Viljoen in conjunction with Heinrich Funck, Hendrik van Rensburg, Taffie Mulder and Louis Brink. Once these courses are approved by Agri SETA, they will be regarded as the accepted practice for training courses.

Decision: (1) As a starting point for a coordinated predation management system, the courses of Niel Viljoen and 4 hunters above, are herewith accepted as baseline for training. All hunters associations will align themselves with the curriculum of Niel's training; (2) If necessary, consult with Free State Hunters Association; (3) Courses to be approved by Agri SETA; (4) Once courses are approved, it should be rolled out to other provinces; and (5) Request from provincial authorities to coordinate Niel's training modules with provinces because of the fact that in most provinces, permits are a requirement for most control methods.

6. RESEARCH PROJECTS

6.9 Predation research to be conducted

- *To focus only on non-lethal methods only shifts the problem and does not solve it. This issue needs to be debated at the PMF Info session in PE.*
- *Anyone can submit research projects for consideration by the RMRD SA.*
- *Predation research is coordinated by the RMRD SA and make funding available for research.*
- *This does not prohibit other commodities/industries to make a financial contribution.*

6.10"Impact of predation on wildlife" – application for funding at DEA

Industries should rather contribute to research than to apply for funding. Research project "Impact of predation on wildlife" to be funded by DAFF.

6.11Predator training

Niel Viljoen presented a video as well as PowerPoint presentation on his training and demonstration/monitor farms. Held 180 courses whereby 3 046 farmers and 3 707 labourers were trained.

Was discussed with Point 5.5 above.

1. *Meeting expressed satisfaction with the outcome of testing with snares and proposed that other methods used in America, be investigated.*
2. *There should be a clear distinction between legitimate and non-legitimate traps and the application of a specific brand will be difficult due to change in legislation once there are changes to traps or the manufacturing of new traps. This change in legislation should be addressed at the meeting in Port Elizabeth and is it the responsibility of Magdel Boshoff.*
3. *The use of traps are associated with training and necessary permits.*

*6.12**Research results***

Prof. HO De Waal presented the meeting with research results – 'Towards the development of a sustainable management strategy for Canis mesomelas and Caracal caracal on rangeland. Ph.D. thesis, University of the Free State, Bloemfontein, South Africa' "

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter SEPTEMBER 2014[879]:

[879] PMF Newsletter SEPTEMBER 2014; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

*"**New research on human-predator conflict***

Prof HO de Waal presented a hard copy of the thesis Towards the development of a sustainable strategy for Canis mesomelas and Caracal caracal on rangeland by Du Plessis, JJ, 2013 to the Predation Management Forum last month. Despite excessive losses and widespread efforts to curb conflicts, there is no sustainable human predator conflict management (HPCM) strategy in place. Livestock owners still tackle the challenges individually or in small groups and concentrate mostly on elimination and precautionary techniques.

Current knowledge on aspects relating to black-back jackal and caracal in SA (including ecology, economics, management techniques, predation rates and sociology) was collated and evaluated. Such information is needed for the development of a sustainable HPCM strategy on livestock farms and wildlife ranches and to further inform policy and decision-making related to these species.

The study further highlighted the overall lack of scientific estimations on the economics as well as HPCM methods of black-backed jackal and caracal predation. [link provided for a transcript of the thesis]"

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter SEPTEMBER 2014[880]:

*"**NWGA attempt to curb predation losses***

Fencing comprises 9% of the tool box of predator control methods, but the reason the percentage is so small may be because fencing is so expensive. The NWGA is going to approach government with a business plan for subsidising wire mesh for fencing. Should government consider a subsidy of 50% on the payment of the wire, farmers will be able to create jobs and pay labourers according to the minimum wage. If the subsidy is taken to 30%, the contribution from government is almost equal to the minimum wage for 24 000 jobs, the predation problem is solved while also creating jobs."

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter OCTOBER 2014[881]:

*"**Vision of coordinated strategy for predation management***

The PMF invited researchers and specialists to discuss a framework for the planning of a coordinated strategy. Dr Gerhard Verdoorn who facilitated the session, was satisfied with the outcome. Provincial conservation agencies are regarded as important stakeholders and after much deliberation, it was decided that each province's unique protocol of conditions for permit implications, as well as their set of checks and balances, should be aligned into an overarching national protocol to be used by all until the long-anticipated norms and standards for the management of damage-causing animals are implemented. The DEA undertook to consult with the provinces in this regard.

It is further essential for farmers to use accredited service providers, such as hunters and trappers, to remove fly by nights who create widespread controversy and carnage in the media. The professional and accredited hunter will focus on removing the particular damage-causing animal. Leon de Beer, NWGA, has been tasked to set up the necessary accreditation of courses through the South African Qualifications Authority (SAQA) and consult with DAFF, the DEA and provincial conservation for their input. Once you reach a point where you cannot allow only people with a particular qualification, you get a permit and continue with accreditation. However, the PMF will keep a list of all accredited trainers and hunters."

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter OCTOBER 2014[882]:

*"**Scientific assessment versus literature study***

[880] PMF Newsletter SEPTEMBER 2014; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[881] PMF Newsletter OCTOBER 2014; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[882] PMF Newsletter OCTOBER 2014; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - Hide Work - Version 5.0

The PMF learnt first-hand about the essence of a scientific assessment during an information session earlier in the month. Researcher and head of zoology at the NMMU Prof Graham Kerley made a clear distinction between a scientific assessment and a literature study (review). He referred to an assessment as a critical evaluation of information for guiding decisions on a complex and public issue. Stakeholders, who are typically decision makers, normally define the topic. It is then conducted by a credible group of experts with a broad range of disciplinary and geographical experience in a balanced and transparent way.

	Review	***Assessment***
Audience	*Scientists*	*Decision makers*
Done by	*One or few*	*Large and varied group*
Topic	*Simple and narrow*	*Broad and complex*
Identifies gaps in	*Research – curiosity driven*	*Knowledge for implementation: problem driven*
(Un)certainty statements	*Not required*	*Essential*
Judgement	*Hidden*	*Required, but clearly flagged*
Coverage	*Exhaustive, historical*	*Sufficient to deal with main range of uncertainty*
Synthesis	*Not required*	*Essential to reduce complexity*

"

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter OCTOBER 2014[883]:

*"**Best practices for managing predation in South Africa***

Livestock farmers have a constitutional right and responsibility to take care of their animals and to protect them from potential threats, such as extreme weather conditions as well as theft and predators. The framework focuses on the best ways to manage predation and this month we are focussing on the use of poison:

Poison as bait

• No poisoned bait may be used in South Africa.

• Notice Nr. R1716 of 26 July 1991 in terms of the Fertilisers, Farm Feeds, Agricultural Remedies and Stock Remedies Act, (Act Nr. 36 of 1947) prohibits the use of any pesticides for purposes other than those indicated on labels.

*o There are no **pesticides** registered for killing predators and pesticides may not be used for that purpose.*

Toxic collars

Toxic collars filled with sodium monofluoroacetate may be used selectively to get rid of predators. No other pesticide may be used in these toxic collars.

• Toxic collars may only be filled and provided by individuals with the necessary permits in terms of the Hazardous Substances Act 15 of 1973.

• In pens where predation is a risk, it is advisable to fit a few of the young lambs with a toxic collar and put them, together with adult sheep, in the enclosure.

• Any predator killed with poison should be buried deep or be burnt to prevent secondary poisoning."

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMF Newsletter OCTOBER 2014[884]:

- **Use of poison unacceptable**
- "*The National Predation Management Forum (PMF) is on record that it does not support in any way the use of poison to prevent predation on livestock*," said Harry Prinsloo, Chairman of the PMF. The effect on the environment and wildlife is simply too big, even though it is not the reason why poisons are used. The recent incident where the use of poison has led

[883] PMF Newsletter OCTOBER 2014; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[884] PMF Newsletter OCTOBER 2014; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - Home Wright - Version 5.0

to the death of vultures in the Eastern Cape, as well as jackals and other wildlife species in the Addo Elephant Park is an example of the detrimental effects caused by the use of poison!

- The PMF, representative of the red meat, wool and mohair farmers and wildlife ranchers, is concerned that producers are still using poison, despite several calls to cease the practice. On the other hand, the use of poison is a sign of the desperation of livestock producers to protect their livestock.
- Government must take note of the desperation and is requested to cooperate with the producer organisations' and the PMF to address the problem at a national level. Local governments are also instrumental to assist in curbing the problems of vagrant dogs and illegal hunting of wildlife with dogs.

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter OCTOBER 2014[885]:

> ***"The impact of predation on the livestock and wildlife-ranching sectors***
>
> *Until recently, the impact of predation on the livestock and wildlife-ranching industries was poorly quantified. The University of the Free State (UFS) took the lead to address this untenable situation and reported on the negative effect of predation on the sheep and goat industries in the five major small livestock producing provinces (Van Niekerk, 2010). This initiative was broadened with a report on the negative effect of predation on commercial beef cattle farms in seven provinces of South Africa (Badenhorst 2014). At the request of Wildlife Ranching SA (WRSA) a study will be conducted by the UFS to estimate the effect of predation on the wildlife-ranching sector. In preparation of this study, the WRSA will inform its members about the survey and request their voluntary participation."*

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMF Newsletter OCTOBER 2014[886]:

- **KZN environmental affairs and farmers cooperate**
- About 70 farmers participated in a successful predation roadshow presented by the KwaZulu-Natal NWGA on 16, 17 and 18 September at Utrecht, Bergville and Swartberg.
- **Niël Viljoen** presented data, collected at more than 30 demonstration farms and showed the advances with lamb survival and weaning percentage when the following manage practices are applied: (i) Know your enemy as well as the breeding dens on the farm (put on your '*velskoene*'); (ii) Predation management must be applied all year round and not only when losses are experienced; (iii) Alternate control methods regularly and apply it responsibly; and (iv) Stay away from untrained and inexperienced hunters.
- **Jan van Biljon** alluded with humour how Anatolian sheep dogs are reared and how they should be managed between different flocks of sheep. An Anatolian sheep dog looks like a dog, bark like a dog, but is actually part of his sheep flock.
- Attendees were surprised about the number of services that KZN Hunters and Conservation provided to farmers. Relations and cooperation between KZN Wildlife Ezemvelo, KZN Hunters and Conservation and farmers is a reality, good relations have been established, and measures have been implemented for the future.
- **Philip Lötter** demonstrated Celmax collars and said the method was applied countrywide with great success. A collar per flock is recommended and farmers must be prepared to respond when an alarm is received from the mobile phone.
- The meetings were closed with panel discussions and the speakers had to stand their ground to answer the questions. Farmers were more positive and departed with many plans.

Little detailed information regarding the training courses which were presented by Mr. Niël Viljoen is available and it seems the content is only privy to those that attend such courses.

[885] PMF Newsletter OCTOBER 2014; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[886] PMF Newsletter OCTOBER 2014; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - Hoë de Waal - Version 5.0

Similarly, in except for summaries provided in PowerPoint presentations and PMF Newsletters, little is publicly available regarding the locations of the demonstration/monitor farms and detail on the results obtained. At the meeting of 24 August 2014, it was noted that 180 courses were presented and 3 046 farmers and 3 707 labourers have been trained.

On 8-9 October 2014, the PMF facilitated a Framework for planning a coordinated strategy at Cape Mohair and Wool (CMW), Port Elizabeth. Discussions are summarised below:

"Attendees: Dr. Gerhard Verdoorn (Facilitator), Harry Prinsloo (PMF Chairman), Leon de Beer (NWGA), Louis du Pisani (NWGA Day 1 only), Coligny Stegmann (SAMGA), Kobus de Klerk (SAMGA) Lardus van Zyl (RPO Large Stock Industry), Gerhard Schutte (RPO Small Stock Industry), Dale Cunningham (WRSA), Mandla Lukhele (DAFF), Joel Mamabolo (DAFF Day 2 only), Magdel Boshoff (DEA), Thomas Mbedzi (DEA), Tim de Jongh (Eastern Cape Environmental Affairs), Jaco van Deventer (Cape Nature), Paul Gildenhuys (Cape Nature), Niel Viljoen (Researcher), HO De Waal (Researcher), Graham Kerley (Researcher Day 1 only), Liaan Minnie (Researcher NMMU) and Bonita Francis (PMF Secretariat). Apologies: Lourens Goosen (Free State Environmental Affairs), Wessel Jacobs (Northern Cape Environmental Affairs), Jan Muller (Mpumalanga Environmental Affairs), Nico Avenant (SA Museum) and Thys de Wet (Researcher).

1. OPENING AND WELCOME

Harry Prinsloo opened the meeting with prayer and welcomed everyone present, especially Prof. Graham Kerley, NMMU. Dr. Gerhard Verdoorn acted as facilitator and briefed the meeting about framework for planning a coordinated strategy for predation.

2. SCIENTIFIC ASSESSMENT

Prof. Graham Kerley, Director: Centre for African Conservation Ecology and Head of Department of Zoology, Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University made a presentation about the Scientific Assessment, due to commence as soon as all funding has been committed.

Concerns by Kerley

- *RMRD funding – money was only released 5 weeks after the submission of the protocol and only to realise that less money was received due to VAT - Dreadfully slow process with the application of protocols.*
- *R1.7 million was the budget 4 years ago – since then, had to review the budget twice.*
- *R1.91 million was put together to produce a really good product, but he cannot initiate the process unless all the funding is in place. He is nervous about the shortfall of R150 000, but he is planning to print less books, which is not advisable.*
- *Assessment should include Wildlife, however, they do not feature in the funding.*
- *He thanked Leon de Beer for creating a mechanism for money to flow.*

Way forward

1. Need political buy-in from Ministers DAFF and DEA. To develop it together whereby PMF go to the Minister, get letter of support and argue for the legitimacy of the process.
2. Need to finalise the funds – unless money is in varsity account, he cannot commence the process.
3. Scientific assessment should be seen as something far bigger than just research. It must be seen as an instrument to encourage government to address the real challenges in South Africa, namely to uplift rural farmers and labourers. If farmer cannot employ labour, they move to towns and cities, associated with poverty and crime. To let

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

government realise the connection between predation and social challenges in SA. He foresees huge investment opportunities for government in the platteland. Key opportunities for job creation are fencing. Government need good models and the extended public works programme could become one for government to invest money on job creation.

4. The Board of SAMGA is meeting at the beginning of November and Kobus de Klerk undertook to discuss the shortfall of R150 000 for the SA with his board. It is an offer, not a commitment and he will inform PMF of the outcome.

DISCUSSION OF THE FRAMEWORK FOR PLANNING A COORDINATED STRATEGY

Producer organisations

Meeting discussed the importance of including communal farmers onto the PMF structure:

- *Communal farmers are represented in the NWGA and SAMGA.*
- *Inclusion of National Emergent Red Meat Producer Organisation (NERPO).*

Harry Prinsloo suggested that the Federation be approached because both RPO and NERPO are represented. However, Lardus van Zyl feels that both commodities feature separately to ease funding of management etc.

Decision: NERPO to be invited as commodity onto the Forum.

- *Discussion took place around unallocated producers not being part of organised commodities and if they should benefit from actions. Prof. Graham Kerley realised the importance of organised structure and suggested that DAFF be approached to put a mechanism in place to get those unallocated producers on board. You would achieve 2 things by solving the lack of representation as well as telling DAFF that you are concerned about the grouping (POLITICAL STRATEGIC MOVE).*
  - *Magdel Boshoff cautioned the industries in the way that they convey representation – some industries according to membership and others according to sector (which includes non-members).*

Decision: Should you want to reap the benefit, producers need to belong to organised agriculture – it could be a carrot for non-committed farmers to get on board.

- *MPO to be invited as commodity onto the Forum, as they are also subjected to predation losses.*

Accredited PM training courses – the procedure

Leon de Beer to get input from departments for development of course content for hunters, trappers, snares courses and get them accredited via Agri SETA. Rope in the support of provincial conservation, DEA and DAFF to underwrite courses.

Dept. of Environmental Affairs

- *Dr. Verdoorn is worried about the succession of officials, using the examples of Magdel Boshoff and Thomas Mbedzi. Magdel Boshoff does not foresee it as a problem, in that there are always 2 persons involved, therefore standing in for one another.*
- *He strongly suggested that the N&S be published and once the Scientific Assessment has been released, that it be adjusted accordingly.*
- *Prof. Kerley suggested that DEA be used as channelling mechanism for the bigger vision.*

DAFF

- *DAFF is seen as the main role player in predation and therefore they need stronger representation on this forum. PMF needs much stronger engagement with DAFF by meeting with the Minister.*
  - *One of the outcomes of the Scientific Assessment will be to re-engage with DAFF, whereby one of the chapters relating to social impact will be a high priority.*
  - *Attempt to engage with the Minister to get his commitment to support the SA.*

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

o *Through NERPO, one can establish good liaison with the DG and other senior officials.*

o *Possibility of informal discussions at Agri Congress next week.*

Provincial conservation agencies

- *A problem that exists is that constitution dictates that national- and provincial legislation are concurrent.*
- *Only way to engage with the provinces is through the MEC (for example one cannot implement TOPS because it relates to the MEC as presiding officer.) Structure called MINMEC (Minister and MEC's) is the body to engage with in order to get their buy in to the proposed framework.*
- *Suggestion that the protocol of Cape Nature, which is based on the N&S, be used as a workable method in all the provinces in the interim. Protocol was determined in cooperation with the WC PMF and it is a form of self-regulation, permits are issued to farmers associations (not individuals) and are valid for 1 year. Very importantly that permit is issued on condition that data is provided when the permit expires. To always bear in mind that a permit is not a right – it is in the hands of the permit issuing officer.*
- *Magdel Boshoff referred to previous suggestion to speed up the process of the N&S, but after hearing presentation of Graham Kerley, it has become necessary to wait out the process. In the mean-time, the Best Practices document can be used to take the process forward until such time that the N&S has been finalised. Seek the support of Minister + MEC's for document by motivating that it is based on the provisions of the N&S.*

Magdel identified the PEPC (Permit and Enforcement Planning Committee) as the platform to discuss the proposal of the PMF, which includes the adoption of the Best Practices document and the use of the Cape Nature protocol. Thereafter, proposal will be channelled through Working Group 1, a government structure for approval – they meet early in 2015. Thereafter the protocols will be implemented.

- *Identify the champion official for DCA control in each province to attend meetings and take the process forward.*
- *Warning that other provinces such as the Free State where the system also works well, will not accept this procedure. Lardus van Zyl is of the opinion that the status quo remains until N&S are finalised.*
- *"Feral dog management" should be scrapped under provincial conservation agencies, since it now resorts under local authorities.*

DECISION: (1) The PMF regards provincial conservation agencies as important stakeholders and after much deliberations it was decided that each province's unique protocol of conditions for permit implications as well as their set of checks and balances, should be aligned into an overarching national protocol to be used by all until such time that the long anticipated Norms and Standards for the Management of Damage-causing Animals are implemented. DEA undertook to consult the provinces in this regard; and (2) Information relating to provincial DCA matters as identified, will be available on PMF Secretariat (HUB).

"Train and accredit PMF specialists"

It is the vision of the facilitator that persons at government level are trained to become specialists in predation management. Need to start writing a workplan for the next 10 years. The following options were discussed: (1) Utilising the offices of DEA on a provincial basis. To possibly employ somebody and let them function from provincial DEA offices (in the EC, there is an office in Queenstown). Magdel Boshoff is however not aware of the functioning of such offices. She however suggested that instead of creating capacity in provinces, to create an enabling environment for training; (2) Include predation management as an additional category in the job descriptions of current

Versie 5.0 – NO de Meat Version 5.0

officers and provide training in that field; (3) DAFF do not have enough capacity to even support the wildlife mandate that it has. The other problem is that there are no permanent positions in DAFF. However, Mandla Lukhele is assured of the willingness of DAFF to assist, but that the problem of predation be presented and packaged to the department so that they can understand the level of criticalness; (4) Cape Nature has a training manual and 2 instructors have been training nature conservation staff on an annual basis, but it has been stopped for reasons of capacity. It will have to be picked up again; (5) Tim de Jongh is of the opinion that capacity cannot be built within departments – work ethic of people have changed. The problem is that the staff turnover is enormous and they make use of consultants. To look at changing the strategy and build capacity in civil society; (6) Leon de Beer said when in discussion with Agri SETA, they mentioned that DAFF has made available R600 000 for the training of extension officers, therefore, should industry come up with a proposal, they could train extension officers; and (7) Magdel Boshoff suggested that instead of building capacity within provincial conservation, that they rather create an enabling environment to allow that capacity to be established, by involving industry to get training companies to do private training ; see what training programs are in place ; who is presenting training and how these trainers manage the system.

Conclusion:

Objective is to get trained people into a formal training environment and accredited and building up a databank of trained persons:

- *There is a need for capacity*
- *Might not reside within provincial conservation, but possibly within DAFF whereby they provide money to Agri SETA for training of extension officers.*
- *To look at building capacity within civil society.*
- *PMF to write a workplan to accommodate the training needs for the next few years.*

"Adopt and underwrite accredited courses"

1. Leon de Beer said the route was followed to get courses accredited through the formal structure of the South African Qualifications Authority (SAQA), which is a system that has credibility and standing in South Africa. However, it is important to have the buy-in from provincial conservationists who are issuing the permits. There is nothing on the table yet, because it is necessary to adjust courses to include all the rules and guidelines. If not agreed with this new direction of SAQA, to provide PMF with alternative. Another positive of Agri SETA is that person receives skill that can be used towards getting a qualification.

2. It is further possible for PMF to get funding under SAQA structure to do training in predation management.

He read the comments received from Wessel Jacobs where he does not regard the SAQA system nor the PMF to be the authority for training, but provincial authorities and legislation.

The NWGA is an accredited service provider whereby course material and training, once approved by Agri SETA, can be provided for. To understand that courses are not accredited, but the service provider, based on the capacity and infrastructure to provide courses. Courses are approved on the basis how it addresses the outcomes as set out in the unit standards, therefore courses are developed around a unit standard. PMF does not want to exclude anybody, but is taking the lead.

This applies to people who are performing services on a professional basis – not farmers on their own farms. Once person has gone for training, he will be issued with a certificate of competence to perform services and should be able to obtain a permit to practice his skills professionally.

Version 5.0 - Pde Wadal - Version 5.0

3. To establish a national accepted training system, government is not required to provide funding or capacity, but provides for the buy-in to adopt and underwrite accreditation courses designed and put into place by industry.

4. Magdel Boshoff foresees a problem in that a SAQA course is a pre-requisite and only vehicle for issuing a permit. Maybe somebody can present same course, same course content, but not a SAQA course. How do you refuse such a person? Her initial proposal was that person is subjected to the minimum training, i.e. minimum course content is compulsory. By implication, provincial environment are regulatory and prescribing training and they do not have the mandate for it.

She explains that in terms of legislation, a SAQA accredited training provider that can get a permit versus someone else who does the same training, but are not issued with a permit. To become a professional hunter, the SAQA qualification is not compulsory – you can still do a 10 day course.

She sees the benefit of SAQA training to set the scene for minimum training, therefore if any other service provider who wants to provide training, it will regard SAQA as minimum and other addition training to provide competitive edge.

The aim of the SAQA course is that it should be recognised as a mechanism to eliminate fly-by-nights. If provincial conservation wants to approve and issue permits to other service providers, they can do so, but do not say that SAQA and PMF is not the vehicle.

Leon de Beer clarified by referring to the wool classing course in the wool industry, where any person can present such a course, but according to industry, all instructors are not on the level of springbok head. The NWGA has accredited instructors and only by way of their training, a springbok head qualification can be issued. To consider going the route whereby to promote a "Jackal head training course" to differentiate between persons having a SAQA qualification versus person who have qualification of attending course with the minimum criteria for training.

<u>Conclusion</u>: (1) Two functions currently under Provincial conservation agencies namely "Train and accredit PM specialists and Record of accredited PM specialists" are to be moved to the PMF secretariat (HUB); (2) Request towards DAFF and DEA and provincial conservation to have an open ear and give the necessary input to course and endorse it when it becomes necessary for courses to be approved at Agri SETA. To further use the current training facility; (3) Besides the SAQA qualification, also need to include the criteria that provincial conservation used to issue permits to professional hunters. Their criteria need to be included in national qualification; and (4) Mr. Leon de Beer, NWGA has been tasked to set up the necessary accreditation of courses through the South African Qualifications Authority (SAQA) and consult with DAFF, DEA and provincial conservation for their buy-in. Once you get to a point where you cannot allow only people with a particular qualification, you get a permit and still continue with accreditation. However, a list will be kept at the PMF of all of all accredited trainers and hunters.

HUNTERS

1. "Equipment specifications"

Section has already been written and has been finalised. To take that portion out of training manual and discuss with provincial conservation if acceptable.

2. "Regulatory proposals for equipment"

According to Coligny Stegmann, it would be impossible to regulate equipment, because products are imported. Paul Gildenhuys said one can only control it by controlling the USE of equipment.

Version 5.0 - PD de Waal - Version 5.0

<u>Action</u>: Niel Viljoen and hunters need to come up with proposals on the use of equipment (example was used whereby unqualified (stadsjapies) purchase equipment for hunting).

3. "Records of culling"

- *The success of the protocol used by Cape Nature, is because of the collection of compulsory data.*
- *There should be a minimum list of data that hunter should collect (Liaan says you need to have a basic understanding of growth and development, because that is crucial to the basic data you need)*
- *All records of culling are stored in the HUB*
- *There should be a standardised form.*
- *Data is compulsory and permits cannot be issued unless data is captured.*
- *Additional point to be added "Protocol of Records". According to Niel, you are not allowed to use your bare hands when dissecting animals – need to wear gloves).*

TRAPPERS

- *It is an absolute specialised skill.*
- *Course has been written by Niel Viljoen. Leon de Beer to lobby with departments for the approval thereof.*
- *Accreditation of trappers is crucial and proper training is an absolute prerequisite to be successful in trapping – need to follow the same route as accreditation of hunters.*

<u>Equipment specifications</u>

- *Need to get all killer traps out of the system and replace with approved devices.*
- *Niel Viljoen and provincial conservation to look at equipment specifications.*

RESEARCHERS (scientific community)

1. Call from researchers to the industry to give guidance as to what research needs to be done. If it is informed by the stakeholders, it is far more applicable to the industry.
2. It is important that research is beneficial to society at time research is done.
3. THRIP is a viable source of additional funding.
4. Scientific Assessment will determine what research still needs to be done.
5. Farmers are subjected to professional jealousy and empire building in the research field and because of that, duplication of projects is evident.
6. Gerhard Schutte referred to the mechanism of the RMRD – structure for research as approved by PMF. It is a very comprehensive system and all institutions are on the bigger committee and no project will be approved if industry is not happy with it. Scientific committee that looks after the predation leg. THEREFORE, THERE IS A TRANSPARENT PLAN ON THE TABLE AND THERE IS ALSO DATA TO AVOID DUPLICATION. Researchers are also able to put proposals forward and about 95% of all projects are accessing THRIP funding. DAFF is represented on the RMRD Subject working group for predation – DEA should also be there to scrutinise projects.

Call for research proposals was circulated a few months ago – to leave process to the RMRD. R4million + THRIP + funding from Wool and Mohair industries. Should there be a shortfall, to approach DAFF and DEA. It is a living document and the framework can be adjusted.

7. Joel Mamabolo confirmed that DAFF should take the lead in issues of predation and food security and that it has become necessary whereby their directorate should have their own budget for research. He referred to the Dept. Education and Training which donates money to THRIP as well as National Research Fund and that they should be

Version 5.0 – H. de Waal – Version 5.0

approached to channel funding to DAFF. He will discuss with Gerhard Schutte about the options.

8. What we envisage for research, in addition to the RMRD, we need to add DAFF and DEA to the graph – they both have directorates for research.

9. Dr. Gerhard Verdoorn said there is money in government structures which we are not accessing and the money is not being spent.

10. All thesis and publications to be stored at the PMF Secretariat (hub). All research done by the RMRD appears on their website. HO de Waal need to digitise file of research at Free State university and make it available electronically.

<u>Conclusion</u>: All research proposals to go to the comprehensive and transparent structure of the RMRD where projects are filtered and priorities are determined. To look at the financial implication of projects, call a meeting through the RMRD and approach proposed funders.

PMF SECRETARIAT (HUB)

- *Information hub (addresses communication, namely newsletter, website, news bulletin, SMS etc.)*
- *Services hub (service you render to farmer).*
- *Capture place for all information, course material, accredited and certified instructors, types of courses etc.*
- *It can be a virtual hub with a manager and a secretariat.*
- *HO de Waal – dedicated institutional memory to be kept and added and made available. Institutional memory does not just relate to the accumulation of information.*
- *Cape Nature operates with a help-desk – have different expertise and a 24/7 service on the website to deal with different issues.*
- *To use the envisaged predation manual as starting point. Have it visualised and have personnel to keep it updated and use it as a living document on the website.*
- *Coligny Stegmann is of the opinion that the HUB and the PMF should be separated because it could be risky for industry because of product being an export product.*
- *Scientific Assessment will eliminate all ethical issues.*
- *Mechanism to involve DAFF in the process is to extend the existing MOU between the NWGA and DAFF to include predation. Financial support would possibly include assisting the training programme of Niel Viljoen and training of extension officers, administration and support of PMF secretariat etc. Joel Mamabolo agreed that ideally the system should be with DAFF or DEA and that it should be driven through the framework of the MOU to kick the process forward.*
- *Gerhard Schutte proposed that the function remains with the NWGA by administrating the PMF secretariat. A certain percentage of time of officials could be channelled to the RMRD. To start with a half day secretary and get a manager to do odd jobs until there is a proper structure. All industries involved could carry the costs of the half day secretary.*
- *Harry Prinsloo is of the opinion to rather spend money on extending the work done by Niel Viljoen – administrative work can carry on within the PMF secretariat.*
- *HO De Waal referred to ALPRU standing too close to PMF in the formation years and that this is a dedicated function which could be done electronically and they have the effective distribution and dissemination of info mechanisms in place. Looking at a permanent facility that operates 24/7 and time needs money to drive it. To break it down and look at the finances assigned to the functions.*
- *Kobus de Klerk referred to the sizes of the different commodities and that financial contributions be determined by a formula. It is the opinion of Harry Prinsloo that the statutory levy of organisations also be considered when determining contributions.*

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

Gerhard Schutte briefly explained that the statutory levy for the RPO has been finalised for the next 4 years but that they will gladly make a contribution towards additional post for secretary.

- *Dale Cunningham said that the wildlife sector do not have a figure relating to predation losses because wild life farmers control their own predators – cannot quantify the value of losses. Funding requests can be taken to Wildlife board members to determine the contribution value of predation functions.*

Decision: (1) Compilation of predation manual; (2) Utilising the existing structure of the PMF secretariat and adding a spare wheel to the system; (3) Leon de Beer, Gerhard Schutte and Bonita Francis to determine to have discussions about how much time such a post will require, costing framework etc.; (4) For the immediate, the half day secretary need to start implementing the actions as prescribed; (5) Determine the costing for additional function and invoice the industries; (6) Over time, the structure will be established; (7) To provide DAFF with a proposal and cost structure for the management of PMF hub and other functions under the existing framework of the MOU; and (8) To look at the model of Agri SA to determine formulas for contribution by industries for predation. Leon de Beer and Gerhard Schutte to discuss with industries. Once costs structure has been determined, one can draw in NERPO and RPO – cannot make them part of the costing structure."

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMF Newsletter NOVEMBER 2014[887]:

- **Good attendance of predation day at Pofadder**
- Great interest was shown by about 70 farmers as far as Kenhardt, Kleinbegin and Kakamas last month when they listened to speakers at Pofadder and participate in and predation conference organised by the Boesmanland Agricultural Union. **Sakkie van Niekerk**, the chairman of Boesmanland was excited about the attendance, especially because only about 40 farmers attended the meeting the previous year at Kakamas.
- J**an Schutte** of KLK Landbou Beperk approached the PMF Secretariat for information to inform farmers about the activities of the Predation Management Forum (PMF). He also informed the farmers about the results of Niël Viljoen's management programme at 30 monitor farms countrywide. Implementing an effective predation management programme with professional and qualified support, predation losses may be reduced to less than 4%. **Chris Fourie**, well-known night hunter in the Northern Cape informed the farmers about the use of professional hunters. **Pieter van der Westhuizen** of KLK provided advice to electrify fences and demonstrated how to erect an electric fence.

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter NOVEMBER 2014[888]:

*"**Best practices for managing predation in South Africa***

Livestock farmers have a constitutional right and responsibility to take care of their animals and to protect them from potential threats, such as extreme weather conditions (cold, heat, droughts, fires etc.) theft and predators. The framework focuses on the best ways to manage predation. This month we focus on preventative measures for predation management.

Jackal-proof mesh fence

We strongly recommend that small-stock farmers fence lambing camp perimeters with mesh fence. Take the following measures to make this mesh fence effective:

- *Use SABS-approved mesh fence with a maximum of 75 mm mesh.*
- *The netting must be at least 1 m high.*
- *Use stones to secure the netting on the ground.*

[887] PMF Newsletter NOVEMBER 2014; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[888] PMF Newsletter NOVEMBER 2014; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 – Uloc de Waal – Version 5.0

• Securely close all possible entrances at gates with netting.

In areas where tortoises and riverine rabbits occur, create a few small openings through which these animals can crawl. Hang chains at these openings to prevent jackal from crawling through.

• Place rods underneath the gates to prevent predators from crawling through.

• Regularly patrols fences to secure any breaches."

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter NOVEMBER 2014[889]: An extensive contact list of control methods, providing the information of individuals and institutions per Province/District, Name, Predation control method and Contact details.

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter NOVEMBER 2014[890]:

*"**Leopards high on the agenda of East Cape PMF***

The Eastern Cape PMF, chaired by Casper Labuschagne of ECNWGA, hosted a well-attended meeting on 12 November 2014.

Issues that were discussed included leopards roaming the Baviaans area, resulting in many sheep falling prey to these animals. Another concern was stray dogs that maimed 96 sheep in the Aliwal North/Jamestown areas. The six monitoring farms of Niel Viljoen are proving to be successful and his training courses are still in high demand.

Although a leopard workshop was initiated in 2011, which did not materialise, the EC PMF is pursuing this and is planning to involve both the Departments of Agriculture and Environmental Affairs in such a workshop.

Members of the meeting expressed gratitude towards the East Cape Forum for being kept informed on important aspects of predation."

2015

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter JANUARY 2015[891]:

*"**A scientific assessment of livestock predation in SA***

Prof Graham Kerley, Centre for African Conservation Ecology at the Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University (NMMU), gave a broad synopsis on the process, whereby a complex problem with multiple stakeholders and conflicting views are envisaged to be addressed by undertaking a Scientific Assessment. The problem of stock loss to predators:

<u>The problem</u>: (i) Extensive loss of livestock; (ii) Costs may exceed R1 billion per annum; (iii) Costs are carried by the individual stock farmer; (iv) Threatens food security, fibre production and the rural economy; and (v) Many interested groups

<u>The current approach</u>: (i) Has had limited success; (ii) Uncoordinated; (iii) Under a variety of government policies; and (iv) Queried by animal right groups

<u>Stakeholder environment</u>: Many stakeholders attempting to address the problem: (i) 4 producer organisations; (ii) 2 national government departments; (iii) Many provincial departments; (iv) NGOs – ranging from biodiversity to animal rights; (v) Universities (research and training); and (vi) Poorly coordinated

<u>The need</u>: A scientifically sound, defensible and applicable way forward that assists in managing the problem."

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter JANUARY 2015[892]: An extensive contact list: Predation management experts / Equipment. The information was provided for

[889] PMF Newsletter NOVEMBER 2014; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[890] PMF Newsletter NOVEMBER 2014; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[891] PMF Newsletter JANUARY 2014; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[892] PMF Newsletter JANUARY 2015; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - Hoole Waal - Version 5.0

individuals and institutions per Province/District, Name, Predation control method and Contact details.

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMF Newsletter JANUARY 2015[893]:

- **DG of Agriculture lend a sympathetic ear towards predation losses**
- An NWGA delegation met in January 2015 with the DG of Agriculture, Prof. Edith Vries, to discuss wool related matters and predation. The DG appreciated the discussions and welcomed forums that represented national interests (such as the PMF). The following matters were brought to her attention:

1. **PowerPoint presentation alluding to the following**:

1.1 Composition of the forum, membership numbers and contribution to NDP
1.2 Actions of the PMF
1.3 Research projects handled and recommended by the RMRDSA
1.4 Application of funds provided by DAFF
1.5 What does the scientific assessment entails
1.6 Training by Niel Viljoen including monitor farms
1.7 Extent of the predation problem
1.8 Control methods
1.9 Challenges

2. **Cooperation between PMF and DAFF (as discussed at PMF meetings and part of framework for coordinated strategy):**

2.1 Training and accreditation of extension officers
2.2 Data base for training of extension officers in predation
2.3 Accreditation of predation training
2.4 Funding mechanism between DAFF and PMF
2.5 Ministerial support for SA
2.6 Trip abroad after SA
2.7 Vagrant dogs

- The DG showed appreciation for the extent of the problem and expressed in principle support for training. Several million rand have been cut from the budget of DAFF and therefore financial support would not be realistic in the near future. The DAFF funds are not even sufficient to support its full staff organisation. Therefore, this situation has implications for future activities of the PMF.

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter FEBRUARY 2015[894]:

*"**Best practices for managing predation in South Africa***

Livestock farmers have a constitutional right and responsibility to take care of their animals and protect them from potential threats, such as extreme weather conditions, theft and predators. The framework focuses on the best ways to manage predation. This month we are focusing on preventative measures for predation management.

Livestock protection collars: These collars protect animals against attacks from predators or deter predators from attacking livestock.

Protecting collars

Protection collars must be made from firm UV-protected plastic.

- *All the sheep in the enclosure should be fitted with collars.*
- *Do not use collars for longer than six weeks in one enclosure.*
- *Whenever the predator starts attacking anywhere else than its neck, remove the collars immediately.*

[893] PMF Newsletter JANUARY 2015; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[894] PMF Newsletter FEBRUARY 2015; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - HD de Waal - Version 5.0

• Alternate protection collars with scented collars, fluorescent collars and sound collars.

• Collars must fit snuggly and not choke the animal.

Deterrent collars

Deterrent collars include those that produce a sound, are made from bright colours or discharge a certain odour:

*• **Bell collars**: Fit bell collars to about a quarter of the herd. Do not use it for more than six weeks. Alternate the collars with other types.*

*• **Coloured collars**: Brightly coloured collars are made from fluorescent material that radiates light at night. Do not used for more than six weeks. Alternate with other collar types.*

*• **Scent collars**: These collars are made from cotton. Various scents are placed on the collar to add a strange scent to the herd. Do not use these collars for longer than six weeks and alternate with other types of collars."*

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMF Newsletter FEBRUARY 2015[895]:

- **Poison ejectors – excellent control method for vagrant dogs** [Lourens Goosen, Problem Animal Control, Free State Province]
- Poison ejectors have been used as legal method to control predators in South Africa since the early 1960s until about 2006. According to the Fire Arms Control Act, Act 60 of 2000, the two models in use were declared illegal because the propellant was classified as ammunition.
- In the meantime two other models have been developed – the M-44, an American product that is still used in the USA – and a new South African device, which still require patent registration. These two devices do not rely on "ammunition" and is therefore not regarded as firearms. Therefore, the necessary justification was provided to DEAT to include it in the norms and standards and to retain these devices in South Africa as part of the toolbox comprising control methods.
- Poison ejectors are good control methods for black-backed jackals, but excellent to control vagrant dogs, especially near human settlements (urban areas) where the use of firearms are not safe and illegal.
- Poison ejectors are legal control methods in some provinces, but the importance of making these devices urgently wider available cannot be overemphasised.

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMF Newsletter FEBRUARY 2015[896]:

- **Top speakers at vermin[897] farmers day**
- The Mortimer Agricultural Association held a farmers day at Cradock to discuss vermin control and research results. About 110 farmers from the district and surrounding areas attended and listened to a group of distinguished speakers, from as far afield as Cape Town, Port Elizabeth and Loxton.
- **Prof. Beatrice Conradie**, University of Cape Town, discussed the economic effect of predators on livestock farmers and predator control. Having studied the topic, she said farming in the Karoo is not regressing because of drought or overgrazing, but because of predators.
- **Prof. Nicoli Natrass**, University of Cape Town, discussed jackals and predator control in the Karoo. She said jackals were in the Cape before Van Riebeeck and in 1899; bounties were already paid to exterminate jackals. She paid homage to dominant jackals on farms because they dominate breeding. She said, "*When these jackals are exterminated, the rest just breed in larger numbers.*"

[895] PMF Newsletter FEBRUARY 2015; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[896] PMF Newsletter FEBRUARY 2015; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[897] Editor's Note: despite efforts to abolish the use of archaic terminology regarding predators and predation management, the word vermin (Afrikaans 'ongedierte') persisted even in a PMF Newsletter.

Version 5.0 - HC de Waal - Version 5.0

- **Niël Viljoen** from Loxton was conducting on behalf of the NWGA a predator management plan countrywide. He emphasised the importance for owners to be involved in farming activities and encouraged farmers to ensure that jackals are not entering the lambing camps. He said predator and flock management, together with veld management, are the most important facets on a farm.
- **Coligny Stegmann**, PMF member, said farmers need an environment that is conducive for job and food security, and where their livestock are safe. According to him, the cost of predation control and losses will never be determined precisely. In addition to the losses of farmers, other role players such as transport companies, fuel suppliers and even butcheries are also incurring losses. He said, "Even the state is losing revenue because of reduced VAT and taxes."
- **Stegmann** also conveyed behalf of **Magdel Boshoff** of Environmental Affairs the progress in norms and standard for predators. He emphasised why everybody in an area must know how to tackle the problem and the minimum requirements in that regard.
- **Liaan Minnie** of NMMU discussed the relation between jackals in parks and on farms.
- **Tim de Jongh** discussed Nature Conservation permits and guidelines for hunting.

On 5 March 2015, Prof. HO de Waal gave a presentation[898] on coordinated predation management at a Free State provincial hunting association, Lettie Fouché Lapa, Bloemfontein, Free State Province.

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter MARCH 2015[899]:

"*Best practices for managing predation in South Africa*

Livestock farmers have a constitutional right and responsibility to take care of their animals and to protect it from all potential threats such as extreme weather conditions (cold, heat, droughts, fires etc.) as well as theft and predators. The framework focuses on the best ways to manage predation and this month we are focussing on preventative measures for predation management.

Shepherds

Shepherds can only be used effectively if the herd is kept in a small enclosure.

Shepherds cannot be expected to overnight with the herd in the veld.

Protective animals

Various types of animals can be used to counteract predators, such as black-backed jackal, caracal, spotted and brown hyenas, leopards and cheetahs in the livestock industry and even the game industry. These animals, just like farm animals, should be managed with the necessary care and attention. They should have free access to food, water and shelter at all times.

1. ***Male ostriches**. Use male ostriches to keep jackal out of the lamb pens.*
2. ***Blesbok rams**. A blesbuck ram in livestock pens deters black-backed jackal during the day or night successfully. There should not be any blesbok ewes in those pens.*
3. ***Donkey stallions** will deter black-backed jackal and caracal from the pens. Remove the donkeys from the pens once the lambs arrive, as the donkeys might injure the lambs at the water trough.*
4. ***Alpacas** can also be used with great success to keep predators away from the livestock.*
5. ***Dogs***

[898] De Waal, HO, 2015. Recent advances in developing a system of coordinated predation management in South Africa. Informed by interacting with the USDA APHIS Wildlife Services and other role players in Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Arizona and Texas from 17-28 May 2010. Vrystaatse Jagters- en Wildbewaringsvereniging. 5 Maart 2015. Lettie Fouché Lapa, Bloemfontein, Suid-Afrika.

[899] PMF Newsletter MARCH 2015; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

5.1 Anatolian shepherds are very effective to protect cattle, sheep and game from nearly all kinds of predators, including lions.

5.1.1 Buy these dogs from reputable breeders who rear the dogs in a farming environment.

5.1.2 Anatolian shepherds should be inoculated against all kinds of diseases and should be examined by a veterinarian regularly.

5.1.3 These dogs need fresh drinking water and food on a daily base.

5.1.4 Anatolian shepherds should be kept away from the other dogs on the farm.

5.2 Herding dogs. Other dogs, trained to herd cattle and sheep can be used. It is also necessary to take good care of other kinds of dogs used in protecting livestock from predators."

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMF Newsletter MARCH 2015[900]:

- **Listen how to reduce predation losses drastically!**
- Leon de Beer, general manager of the NWGA, talked to Radio Pretoria's '*Klank Koerant*' (Sound Paper) about the rabies outbreak in KwaZulu-Natal and the fact that jackals are the vectors. The conversation was about predators in general and Leon alluded to the 30 monitor farms countrywide where predation practices were applied. When no management is practiced, livestock losses can be as much as 25%.

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter APRIL 2015[901]:

"Progress: scientific assessment

A written report by Prof Graham Kerley at the NMMU served at the most recent PMF meeting indicated a delay in the finalisation of funding from various sources. This means that the scientific assessment could not be initiated and for this reason, available funds have not yet been used. Some, non-expense incurring measures have been taken. It is hoped that the scientific assessment will be launched in May, once all the funding contracts are finalised.

According to Thomas Mbedzi the Department of Environmental Affairs is putting all systems in place to proceed with the implementation of the norms and standards, which include the completion of the scientific assessment and the assistance of the Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, with specific outstanding provisions of the norms and standards."

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMF Newsletter APRIL 2015[902]:

- **Woollies wants predator friendly meat**
- An article by Lucille Botha on 20 April 2015 in Landbou.com, Woolworths maintained that up to 80% of predators are still killed in traditional ways, while they want to buy predator friendly meat. The PMF viewed the article with hesitation. Woolworths hoped to sell mutton and/or lamb by the end of the year that indicate on the label it is friendly towards predators.
- Mr. Harry Prinsloo, chairman of the National NWGA and the PMF was not aware of this project, but believed the objective would be the same as what the wool sheep industry prescribes in its code of best practices, and said, "*I am of the opinion that our mutton is already predator friendly because we apply this code.*"

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMF Newsletter APRIL 2015[903]:

- **What does the PMF do?**

[900] PMF Newsletter MARCH 2015; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[901] PMF Newsletter APRIL 2015; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[902] PMF Newsletter APRIL 2015; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[903] PMF Newsletter APRIL 2015; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - Hilo de Waal - Version 5.0

- It was the question Jaco Loots, chairman of the Sneeuberg Agricultural Association wanted to share with farmers at an information day on 17 Marc 2015t in Nieu-Bethesda. Juan Venter, production advisor in the Eastern Cape informed about 25 farmers on the functions and activities of the PMF, which is representing the red meat, wool and mohair industries. The NWGA managed the secretariat and role players include livestock industries, researchers, and scientists, national departments of agriculture and environmental affairs, and professional hunters. Dr. Gerhard Verdoorn plays a vital role as independent specialist and advisor.
- Because of the astronomical damage caused by predation, the PMF continues as a priority to have predation declared as a national disaster. The development of best practices for predation management is part of the goal, as well as the implementation of a communication strategy, which includes a website and monthly newsletter. Predation research is conducted by the RMRDSA and a coordinated approach for professional hunters/accreditation of training courses are planned.

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter MAY 2015[904]:

> *"**The Karoo Predator Project***
>
> *The Karoo Predator Project is a partnership between the University of Cape Town, the WWF Nedbank Green Trust, Cape Nature and the farmers of the Central Karoo. The project aims to understand predator ecology to mitigate conflict with farmers. WWF Nedbank Green Trust and the University of Cape Town are the biggest sponsors of the ecological part of the project. The National Woolgrowers Association of SA (Western Cape) has made a financial contribution towards the predator expert Niel Viljoen's involvement in the project to catch and tag predators, as well as the Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries partly funding the project through the PMF and approved by the RMRDSA.*
>
> *The Karoo Predator Project mainly works in two different sites in the Western Cape. The first site involves a group of 22 farms in the Koup district, between the towns of Laingsburg and Beaufort West in the Central Karoo. Some parts of the project extend to the whole Central Karoo region. The second site is Anysberg Nature Reserve, managed by Cape Nature and situated in the Little Karoo between Laingsburg, Ladismith, Montagu and Touws River."*

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMF Newsletter MAY 2015[905]:

- **Eastern Cape PMF**
- The Eastern Cape held its annual PMF in Port Elizabeth. Coligny Stegmann of SAMGA spoke about the successful predator day at Cradock that was attended by about 100 farmers. As a result, the information day conducted by Niël Viljoen the following day at Schoombee was also well attended.
- Juan Venter, NWGA production advisor, provided feedback on progress with monitor farms in the districts of Maclear, Dordrecht, Hofmeyer, Adelaide, Jansenville and Aberdeen.
- Concern was expressed about variations in the Eastern Cape Hunt Proclamation. It was agreed to request the Eastern Cape Nature Conservation in a letter to standardise hunt permits in line with the guidelines of the Eastern Cape Department of Economic Development, Environmental Affairs and Tourism.

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter MAY 2015[906]:

> *"**Predator courses***
>
> *Niel Viljoen will be conducting predator courses in the following districts:*

[904] PMF Newsletter MAY 2015; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[905] PMF Newsletter MAY 2015; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[906] PMF Newsletter MAY 2015; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 – HC de Waal – Version 5.0

- *9 June 2015 - Humansdorp*
- *24 June 2015 - Ugie (for emerging farmers)*
- *25 August 2015 - Venterstad*

Contact Niel at (telephone) or e-mail nielviljoen@gmail.com for more information"

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMF Newsletter MAY 2015[907]:

- **Woolworths: predator friendly lamb on shelves**
- The article in Landbou.com, where Woolworths envisaged selling predator friendly meat by the end of the year, drew wide reaction.
- In an article AgriECHO, Dr Gerhard Verdoorn alluded to the wisdom of predator friendly meat; he was sceptical and questioned whom the arbiter would be to decide who would decide if meat is produced predator friendly. The seriousness of predation should not be disregarded and when a specific retailer regarded livestock predation as of no consequence, he "*as conservationist, farmer-without-a-farm and advisor to the PMF, questioned the* bona fides *of marketing*".
- Verdoorn said, "*The PMF made good progress with ecologically adapted predation management and the golden middle road of integrated predation management," He referred to the training by Niël Viljoen and the farms where integrated predation management is applied showing that small livestock losses of as small as 2 to 4%. To think the mere use of flock protecting animals only would solve predation, is wish thinking.*"
- Thys de Wet, independent predator specialist and researcher, referred in Farmers' Weekly and Landbouweekblad to scientific results questioning the predator friendliness of Anatolian dogs. In a 2002 study by Dr. Laurie Marker of the Cheetah Conservation Fund in Namibia, 94,4% of the dogs exhibited behaviour problems and only 61% of the dogs could be rehabilitated with corrective training and deployed as working dogs.
- Research in the USA also showed that one third of herd protection dogs are shot because of problems they caused. In 2011, an MSc thesis confirmed the unreliable status of Anatolian herd dogs, because 63% of the dogs killed among others jackals, baboons, caracal and even a leopard. It is contrast to Woolworths, who is trying to buy only meat from farmers that bought into the programme and encouraging non-lethal predator control including Anatolian or Maluti dogs, llamas, collars, alpacas and herders.
- De Wet said, "*It is not wrong to strive for predator friendly damage control of livestock – the ideal MUST be pursued. However, much more information is needed and spend on research before this ideal will be realised*."

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMF Newsletter MAY 2015[908]:

- **Accredited predator management courses soon possible**
- Training material on predation management compiled by Niël Viljoen and a team of experts has been submitted to AgriSETA for approval to be used in competency training in predation management. When AgriSETA has approved the material, it would open the way to conduct training under the auspices of the SETA (an accredited training authority). Learners, who complete the course successful, earn credits that may lead to a qualification or an apprenticeship. Upon approval, the course will be presented at SAQA levels 2 and 5.
- The PMF supports the initiative and hope the training of key persons would contribute towards expanding the expert pool of predation management in order to increase the effect of training!

[907] PMF Newsletter MAY 2015; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[908] PMF Newsletter MAY 2015; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - No de Wet - Version 5.0

On 26 May 2015, Prof. HO de Waal gave a presentation[909] on the impact, extent and management of predation at the North West RPO Congress, Vryburg, North West Province.

On 28 May 2015, Prof. HO de Waal gave a presentation[910] on the impact, extent and management of predation at the Dordrecht Veld Sheep Show on the farm Avondzon, Dordrecht, Eastern Cape Province.

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter JUNE 2015[911]:

> ***"Role of livestock guard dogs in predator control on Namibian farmlands***
>
> *Livestock guard dogs are promoted as a non-lethal, environmentally friendly method to mitigate the conflict between predators and livestock farmers. As part of a farmer-carnivore conflict mitigation programme, the Cheetah Conservation Fund breeds Anatolian shepherds to protect livestock from predators. The results challenge the categorisation of livestock guard dogs as a non-lethal conflict mitigation method. The research team, consisting of Gail C Potgieter, Graham IH Kerley and Laurie L Marker, suggests that the conservation status and body size of wild carnivores relative to the size of the guarding dogs, be considered before introducing dogs to protect livestock."*

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMF Newsletter JUNE 2015[912]:

- **Positive feedback on predation course**
- "*Doe so voort*" [continue so onward], said farmer regarding predation course.
- Positive feedback from Richard Biggs on the predation course that was presented by Niël Viljoen. "*I and two of my farm workers attended the course at the farm Vrede, Kamdeboo, Graaff-Reinet district. With the knowledge that Niël shared that day, I have considerable more lambs to market.*" He requested Niël for the dates of future courses because he wanted to sharpen his knowledge as well as those of his farm workers by attending similar management courses.

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMF Newsletter JUNE 2015[913]:

- **Knowledge is strength**
- A good starting point for effective predation management is the farmer's toolbox with all available control and management methods. Knowledge of the life cycle and behaviour of predators are also very important. Some methods in the tool kit are more effective during specific phases in the life cycle of predators. The correct method used at the right time provides the best results. Similarly, farmers must try to adapt the livestock and veld management to the life cycle of predators to minimise potential losses.
- Full article by Niël Viljoen. http://www.pmfsa.co.za/home/knowledge-library/popular-articles/niel-viljoen/item/173-kennis-is-mag

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter JUNE 2015[914]:

> ***"Success with electrical fencing***
>
> *Petrie Botha who farms in the Middelburg district, Eastern Cape, has the following remedy for his predation problem. "I have electrified the fence around my lambing camps – the best thing ever! The extra lambs of the first two seasons will pay it off completely!*

Version 5.0 HO de Waal - Version 5.0

[909] De Waal, HO, 2015. Die omvang, impak en bestuur van predasie. Noordwes RPO Kongres - Vooruitstrewende Rooivleisproduksie in die Praktyk. 26 Mei 2015. Vryburg, Noordwes Provinsie, Suid-Afrika.
[910] De Waal, HO, 2015. Die omvang, impak en bestuur van predasie. Dordrecht Veldskaapskou, Avondzon. 28 Mei 2015. Dordrecht, Ooskaap Provinsie, Suid-Afrika.
[911] PMF Newsletter JUNE 2015; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[912] PMF Newsletter JUNE 2015; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[913] PMF Newsletter JUNE 2015; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[914] PMF Newsletter JUNE 2015; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

In the January 2015 Newsletter, the Framework for Best Practices for managing predation in South Africa elaborated on electrical fencing and how it can be used as a preventative measure for predator control."

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter JUNE 2015[915]:

How to use dog hunting packs in the Eastern Cape

Apart from restrictions set aside by the SPCA, the East Cape Environmental Affairs stipulates that you may keep a dog pack in conjunction with the Ordinances below.

However, the Ordinance on Nature and Environmental Conservation, Ordinance 19 of 1974, and Provincial Notice No. 955 of 1975 stipulates the following:

82. (1) (b) The MEC may make regulations regulating and restricting the use of dogs in the hunting of any wild animal in any area in respect of which the operation of section 29 (l) has been suspended by proclamation under section 79 (b),

Section 42 of the Regulations (Provincial Notice No. 955 of 1975) state:

No land owner in an area in which the application of section 29 (l) of the ordinance has been suspended by proclamation under section 79 (b) of the ordinance may permit the use of more than eight dogs over the age of one year and four dogs under the age of one year in any particular hunt on such land.

MAY THEY GO ONTO ANY FARM WITHOUT PERMISSION?

No they may not!

Ordinance on Nature and Environmental Conservation, Ordinance 19 of 1974 stipulates:

*'**Owner of land may permit other persons to hunt wild animals on his land.***

39.(1) Subject to the provisions of this ordinance, any owner of land may permit any other person to hunt in accordance wiyh such provisions any wild animal on the land of such owner andto remove any such animal or the carcass of any such animal on such land.

(2) Subject to the provisions of subsection (3) no permission granted in terms of subsection (1) shall be valid unless it is reduced to writing and reflects-

(a) the full names and address of the owner concerned and of the person to whom it is granted, and

(b) the number and the species of wild animal, the date or dates and the land in respect of which it is granted,

and is signed and dated by such owner.

(3) The provisions of subsection (2) shall not apply in respect of permission granted in terms of subsection (1) to any relative or full-time employee of any owner of land.

Hunting of wild animals on land belonging to another person.

40. No person shall on land of which he is not the owner hunt any wild animal or remove any such animal or the carcass of such animal from such land without the permission of the owner of such land granted in terms of section 39.

To summarize Section 39 and 40 – you may only hunt on someone else's property if you have their written permission, which has to be in your possession during the hunt."

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter JULY 2015[916]:

*"**Where can I find a jackal calendar?***

Petrie Botha, who farms in the Middelburg district, Eastern Cape, wants to know where he can find a jackal calendar – one that indicates when the young is born etc. With reference to the location of a den, where jackal are when they call at sunrise, about 3:00 am, sunset and about 10:00 am.

The PMF Secretariat referred him to an article by Niel Viljoen on the PMF website, called Kennis is mag, in which Niel refers to the life cycle and behaviour of predators. http://www.pmfsa.co.za/home/knowl-edge-library/popular-articles/niel-viljoen/item/173-kennis-is-mag

[915] PMF Newsletter JUNE 2015; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[916] PMF Newsletter JULY 2015; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 – HO de Waal – Version 5.0

Thys de Wet, predator expert replied:

'Although jackal are one of only a few predatory species that breed only once a year, there can be up to four weeks' difference in any specific activity. The first sign of jackal easing into breeding is when they start howling more frequently in May and June. This is when they become increasingly territorial for where they want to breed without competition. Even the pups from the previous breeding season are chased away. During this time, they also choose a den. By late May to June, mating occurs and den sites are prepared. As the female carries the pups for around 63 days, the pups are born from August to September. For the first three weeks, the female stays with the pups. The male collects the food and brings it to the den. Thereafter, the female accompanies the male every now and then to help with food gathering. Sometimes young jackal from the previous litter share guard duty and food gathering.

Once the new litter start spending more time outside the den, at about four weeks, the female moves the pups to a new, clean den. This may occur more than once. The female then moves the pups whenever humans or predators come close to the den. Through November and December, the young animals still do not accompany the adults and stay close to one of several dens. Through January and February, the pups accompany the adults, and by March and April, they start exploring on their own. During the rest of the year, they do not stay near the den and although most of their activity is in close quarters, they do move around quite a bit. They only flee into burrows when they are pressured. They actually use burrows for only four months out of every 12 months.

During the breeding season, jackal howl less than usual, as they do not want to give away the location of their dens. Howls at sunset and sunrise may be close to the daytime resting site, but they do not always return to the same site every day. Howls at other times can be anywhere in their hunting area or on the edge of their home range, while patrolling and marking the home range.

Properly constructed and maintained electric fencing around lambing camps are an excellent way to a better weaning percentage when predators are present on the farm.'"

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter JULY 2015[917]:

*"**Eastern Cape legislation – Acceptable controlled methods***

The following information is taken from the Eastern Cape legislation and focuses on acceptable control methods for predators and which methods require permits in the Eastern Cape. The information was supplied by Gerrie Ferreira, DEDEAT, Eastern Cape. Contact him [telephone].

Black-backed jackal and caracal

Acceptable control method = Section 29 (a) [poison] – only poison registered specifically for these species may be used, (d) [traps – excluding wire snares and gin traps without an offset and set screw, (g) [calibre less than 5,6 mm], (h) [automatic] and (l) [dog].

Section 33(1) - use of a motor vehicle only.

Control method requiring a permit = Culling at night with an artificial light.

Leopard

Acceptable control method = Trap cages and hunting with dogs only.

Control method requiring a permit = All methods require a Tops permit.

Crows

Acceptable control method = Hunting during the day or night.

Control method requiring a permit = Night hunting/culling.

Brown hyena

Acceptable control methods = Hunting with dogs only or trap cages.

[917] PMF Newsletter JULY 2015; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal, Version 5.0

Control method requiring a permit = All methods require a Tops permit.
Spotted hyena
Acceptable control methods = Hunting with dogs only or trap cages.
Control method requiring a permit = All methods require a Tops permit."

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMF Newsletter JULY 2015[918]:

- **Foothold trap course provided hope for farmers in the Humansdorp area**
- Three years ago, farmers in the Humansdorp district attended their first predation course presented by Niël Viljoen. At that stage, jackals were not a problem yet. Three years later the problems caused by jackals increased to an extent where Niël was approached to present further training. The course was conducted at the farm of Kevin Pretorius next to the Kouga River and attended by 13 farmers and 22 farm workers. The morning was devoted to theory and practical demonstrations were presented the afternoon. Participants were taught to set foothold traps and the areas studied where foothold traps should be set. They had to observe signs in the veld and scanned for shrubs where jackals drop scat, which are ideal for setting foothold traps.
- Niel du Preez, NWGA executive member in the Kareedouw/Humansdorp area said farmers were excited and returned to their farms with the new acquired skills, which would help to curb the jackal problem in the area.

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter JULY 2015[919]:

*"**M.Sc. Agric thesis by Coenraad Geldenhuys Badenhorst on the economic cost of large stock predation in the North West. (July 2014)***

The study focused on predation losses of cattle in South Africa. Five main objectives were pursued:

1. to quantify the direct and indirect losses ascribed to predation
2. to determine the effect of predation on the large livestock industry in North West
3. to investigate the underlying structures in the predation prevention practices used by farmers in North West
4. to improve the understanding of the current behaviour of the farmers in preventing predation, and
5. to investigate factors that influence predation in North West, to identify prevention approaches associated with reduced predation. Such information may contribute to the identification of possible best management practices for predation prevention.

Based on the findings from this study, farmers should use predation management methods in the correct manner and more farmers should start working together in a coordinated manner. Farmers should not hunt with dogs, nor use cage traps if there is little predation on the farm, specifically if the rest (63%) of the farmers do not use predation management methods. Some farmers do not use hunting with dogs and cage traps to prevent predation, but instead kill predators that do not cause harm to livestock and so create a vacuum effect for other predators to move in.

It is evident that a coordinated strategy to manage predation in the province and in South Africa be established. This does not have to be the responsibility of government or producer organisations, but could be as small as a farmers' organisation. However, it would help if government could work closely with livestock producers and organisations to coordinate predation management. Government could provide funds to producer organisations, training farmers in the management of predation. Producers still have the

[918] PMF Newsletter JULY 2015; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[919] PMF Newsletter JULY 2015; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 – H.O. de Waal – Version 5.0

20732 *primary responsibility for managing predation on their farms, but policymakers could*
20733 *change legislation to protect farmers. Government and producer organisations must help*
20734 *farmers by funding staff to assist farmers to identify cause of death of animals. This will*
20735 *help farmers to apply correct management strategies and prevent them from killing*
20736 *predators that do not kill livestock.*
20737 *Visit the PMF website for the thesis: http://etd.uovs.ac.za/ETD-*
20738 *db//theses/available/etd-02232015-151323/unrestricted/BadenhorstCC.pdf."*
20739
20740 The following items (translation) were reported in the PMF Newsletter JULY 2015[920]:
20741 • **Listen to interviews**
20742 • Monitor on RSG talked to Thys Delport, chairman of the Western Cape NWGA, about
20743 the successful functioning of a predation management forum in the Western Cape, the
20744 problems with jackals and caracal, the extent of the damage, what control methods are used,
20745 whether farmers are still using poison and the media used to inform farmers about predation.
20746 • http://www.pmfsa.co.za/images/mp3/Thys_Delport_Monitor1.mp3
20747 • 'Spektrum' on RSG talked to dr. Gerhard Verdoorn of the Griffon Poison Information
20748 Centre about the reason why preventative measures for predation control is better than
20749 shooting or poison, as well as the successful training programme of Niël Viljoen and where
20750 farmers can seek help about predation.
20751 • http://www.pmfsa.co.za/images/mp3/Gerhard_Verdoorn1_Spektrum.mp3
20752
20753 The following item (translation) was reported in the PMF Newsletter AUGUST 2015[921]:
20754 • **Practical advice on problem animal control**
20755 • Practical management guidelines of predation control for livestock farmers and wildlife
20756 ranchers are shown in a DVD, which was recently released. The DVD is a training initiative of
20757 Niël Viljoen in cooperation with the wool industry. Niël believes too many predators are blamed
20758 for livestock losses, when it may be ascribed as a management problem. Therefore, it is
20759 important to focus on specific problems. Predators can only be linked to carcasses, which were
20760 retrieved. The most important advice provided by Niël in the DVD, is that the species must be
20761 identified by its feeding patterns, habitat and behaviour before the correct control method is
20762 used. "*Farmers must start put their walking shoes on again and study their farms and area,*
20763 *because the black-backed jackals know it better than the farmers*," said Viljoen.
20764 • The DVD cost R220; postage included and is available at the NWGA head office
20765 (telephone) or nwga@nwga.co.za, as well as the NWGA provincial offices in Carnarvon,
20766 Harrismith, Bloemfontein, Caledon and Middelburg.
20767
20768 The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter AUGUST 2015[922]:
20769 *"**Ineffective permit issuing***
20770 *A letter was sent to the director general of the Department of Environmental Affairs*
20771 *(DEA) regarding the inconsistent legislation between provincial conservation*
20772 *departments, which creates a great deal of frustration among farmers. One farmer could*
20773 *have more than one farm and be exposed to a completely different approaches in terms*
20774 *of managing damage-causing animals. The rationale behind the fact that 100 permits*
20775 *can be issued for leopards for trophy hunting versus permits issued for the control of*
20776 *DCA purposes was also debated at a recent PMF meeting.*
20777 *The DEA was requested to provide the PMF with a way forward and in which way the*
20778 *PMF can take hands with the DEA to advise farmers on appropriate management*
20779 *systems. The presence of the DEA at PMF steering committee meetings was*

[920] PMF Newsletter JULY 2015; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[921] PMF Newsletter AUGUST 2015; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[922] PMF Newsletter AUGUST 2015; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - 10 oc (yaal - version 5.0

acknowledged and valued, and helps the DEA to stay abreast of issues relating to predation."

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter AUGUST 2015[923]:

*"**The NSPCA about Illegal hunting with dogs***

There is a degree of uncertainty regarding the unlawful use of dogs for hunting purposes. Hunting with dogs has roots in various cultures and traditions. In recent times, however, although traditional hunting occurs in some areas, it has been taken over by a more modernised form known as "taxi hunts". This form of hunting is carried out by urban residents with packs of expensive dogs and little respect for private property.

Unlawful hunting with dogs is a serious offence. The main purpose of the article featured in the February 2015 edition of Servamus (SAPS), is to ensure that the correct procedures are followed, evidence is preserved for prosecution purposes and that the dogs are dealt with humanely and in the correct manner, as called for by the circumstances. Click here to read the article:

http://www.pmfsa.co.za/home/predator-identification/wild-dog/control-methods-vs-legislation-stray-dog"

The PMF Steering Committee met on 26 August 2015 at the UFS in Bloemfontein. Prof. HO de Waal gave a presentation[924] on the way forward regarding coordinated predation management. He focused on the Concept of Coordinated System of Predation Management, leading to a viable OPTION for consideration by the PMF. ALPRU's request was made well in advance to give a presentation, but the chairman reduced the time allotted for the presentation substantially; thereby lessening the impact.

The annual meeting of the PMF was held the next day on 27 August 2015 at the University of Free State; excerpts of the minutes are quoted below:

*"Present: **NGWA** - Harry Prinsloo (Chairman), Guillau du Toit (National Chairman NWGA), Leon de Beer (General Manager), Louis du Pisani (Nat. Manager: Production Advice and Development), Casper Labuschagne (Eastern Cape), Gerrit du Toit (Northern Cape), Douglas Calldo (Western Cape), Machiel Odendaal (Mpumalanga), Schalk Jacobs (Free State), Hendrik Botha (also representing KwaZulu-Natal RPO), **SA Mohair Growers' Assoc.** - Coligny Stegmann, Petrie Maré, Robyn Rutters (SAMGA), **Wildlife Ranching SA** - Gert Dry, **RPO** - Lardus van Zyl (Large Stock Industry), Gerhard Schutte (Small Stock Industry), Nic Zaayman (Free State), Koning Scholtz (Northern Cape), Dirk Krapohl (Northern Cape), Sakkie van Zyl (North West), **ALPRU/UFS** - HO de Waal [and per invitation by HO de Waal also Nico Avenant, Walter van Niekerk, Quinette Kruger, Andries Strauss and Anche Schepers], Neil Viljoen (Researcher), Thys de Wet (Scientist), **Environmental Affairs** - Magdel Boshoff (DEA), Thomas Mbedzi (DEA), Wessel Jacobs (Northern Cape), Lourens Goosen (Free State), Tim de Jongh (Eastern Cape), **DAFF** - Mandla Lukhele, **Free State Hunters** - Daan Bodenstein, **Griffon Poison Information Centre** - Gerhard Verdoorn and **PMF Secretariat** - Bonita Francis. Apologies: Thys Delport (NWGA, Western Cape), John Durr (RPO, Western Cape), Jaco van Deventer (Cape Nature), Hannes Blom (Free State, Environmental Affairs), Dale Cunningham (WRSA) and James Faber (RPO, Northern Cape). Absent, no apology received: Koos Davel (RPO, Mpumalanga), Sam Makhubele (Limpopo, Environmental Affairs) and Graham Keet (KwaZulu-Natal, Environmental Affairs). Motions of Condolences: Hendrik Botha (loss of his wife, Brenda), Jason Badenhorst (died in accident) and Kobus de Klerk (loss of his mother).*

[923] PMF Newsletter AUGUST 2015; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

[924] De Waal, HO, 2015. The way forward. A system of coordinated predation management. Predation Management Forum. 26 & 27 August 2015. Raadsaal, Landbougebou, University of the Free State, Bloemfontein, South Africa.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

3 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the previous meeting which were held on 28 August 2014 at the University of Free State, were approved on the proposal of Tim de Jongh and seconded by Casper Labuschagne. Some cause for confusion was noted with the minutes relating to traps and snares – extract from minutes:

"6.3 Predator training: There should be a clear distinction between legitimate and non-legitimate traps and the application of a specific brand will be difficult due to change in legislation once there are changes to traps or the manufacturing of new traps. This change in legislation should be addressed at the meeting in Port Elizabeth and is it the responsibility of Magdel Boshoff."

Neil Viljoen referred to decision that the Terminator, which is manufactured in Prins Albert, should be used. Meeting enquired if the legislation has been adopted.

4. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

4.1 Feedback on the status of the DCA Norms and Standards and TOPS (arising)

Magdel Boshoff reported that N&S have not yet been implemented, although public participation process have been finalised and 90% complete. Two key areas need to be in place before implementation, namely the finalisation of the Scientific Assessment and a training system. Currently DEA do not have a mandate to prescribe training.

5. MATTERS FOR DISCUSSION

5.1 PMF HUB

Dr. Gerhard Verdoorn informed the meeting of an extensive plan to establish a Management and Information Centre for Predation. An academic institution with established expertise in wildlife is recommended to manage the centre and report to the PMF Steering Committee.

Comments: (1) Predation Management Information Centre needs managerial skills, not a scientist. Call for network who works nationally and internationally; (2) Technical aspects need to be clarified – universities need to know with who they are signing a contract with – not PMF, but possibly the NWGA who is a service provider and legal entity; (3) It is important to look at a coordinated approach of the system – all companies need to contribute because all is affected by losses due to predation; (4) If the PMIC is functioning properly, then departments can be approached for funding. It is the duty of producers to use and make the system work; (5) Database to be rolled out to permit issuing offices; and (6) To be called a Predation Management Information Centre (PMIC) instead of HUB.

Decision: (1) Gerhard Verdoorn was congratulated with the compilation of plan; and (2) On the proposal of Gerrit du Toit, the principle of PMIC was accepted. To proceed and compile tender document, send to universities. When budgets are ready to be allocated, to relook and take a decision to proceed. Any additional commentary to be sent to Bonita Francis, PMF Secretariat.

5.2 Predator friendly meat – Woolworths

The meeting took cognisance of telephonic discussion between the Chairman and Woolworths and PMF's intention to invite them to the next steering committee meeting.

5.3 Adoption and underwriting of accredited courses (arising)

Leon de Beer explained that the NWGA is an accredited service provider under AgriSETA and that learning material for predation course has been developed, whereby a certificate of competence can be issued upon completion. The NWGA may apply for funding from Agri SETA and DAFF have already committed funding to AgriSETA for the

Version 5.0 - HD de Waal - Version 5.0

training and upscaling of knowledge of extension officers. PMF will request DAFF to facilitate their training needs in predation management.

The meeting learned that there could be many loopholes in SAQA minimum requirements therefore it is necessary that provincial departments of environmental affairs may set higher standards to strengthen the requirements. Standards need to be uniform and be written as such that the same permit can be issued in all the provinces. Provincial authorities welcomed the proposed procedure and should be allowed to accredit training service providers based on their needs and standards.

Decision: (1) DEA Permit & Enforcement Planning Committee meets in November 2015 and under the guidance of Magdel Boshoff, Leon de Beer and Neil Viljoen, the SAQA minimum requirements and additional standards to training material needs to be re-written and finalised; (2) Leon de Beer to circulate the minimum requirements of the course to Magdel Boshoff for distribution to provinces; (3) The suggestion by Lardus van Zyl was accepted whereby, at the same time, to also address the necessary training conditions for the ghetter; (4) The attendance of annual PMF meeting by DEA provincial officials is very important – specifically Limpopo and North West who is never present. To use the forum of Permit Working Group to emphasise the necessity for attendance; and (5) Request to DEA to put predation management as a standing point on agenda of Permit Working Group.

5.4 Poison

5.4.1 Official viewpoint of PMF
5.4.2 Independent viewpoint on legal use of poison for predator
5.4.3 Provincial legislation
5.4.4 Code of Best Practice

The meeting took note of all the above and the levels of uncertainty regarding the legality of 1080 poison bate.

The official viewpoint of the PMF was re-affirmed in that PMF is against the illegal use of poison, which is also contained in the Code of Best Practice. It is the chairman's viewpoint that farmers are the custodians of biosecurity and he referred to the many vultures and cranes who are seen in the Southern Free State area, therefore farmers are doing something right because positive things are happening in nature.

Coligny Stegmann is of the opinion that farmers are so despondent due to predation losses, that poison is their last resort. Poison is not preferred or accepted, but the dire circumstances lends to the method. To be used positively to put pressure on government to leverage funding and assistance with the problem.

5.5 M44 device

Lourens Goosen explained about a private initiative whereby the concept is legitimate in the Free State, but the device is not, due to poison mechanism. Awaiting legislation in the finalisation of the Norms and Standards to make device ready for the market.

Coligny Stegmann referred to decision of Steering Committee that the importation of devices will take place within provincial departments, placing it under state control. Provincial officials will issue the permits with necessary training for farmers.

Magdel Boshoff indicated that DEA will have no problem to include the device in the Norms and Standards. Need information from Gerhard Verdoorn to write it into the regulations. Provinces can continue with the issuing of permits.

Decision: Work in progress. Gerhard Verdoorn, Lourens Goosen and Provincial Departments Environment will come up with workable plan by the next meeting in November 2015.

5.6 Report back from provincial PMF

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Verspreiding

5.6.1 Issues from provincial predation management forums

5.6.1.1 WC predation, including Baboons - Douglas Calldo reported on the huge problem of baboons, which are experienced by 70% of farms in the Western Cape. To include Baboons in the same category as Jackal and Lynx as predators. Meeting scheduled with WC Minister and Cape Nature to address the situation.

Each province had an opportunity to report on predation related issues.

Meeting took cognisance of many outbreaks of rabies in KwaZulu-Natal.

5.7 Report back from provincial departments of Environment

Each provincial department had an opportunity to report on predation related issues.

5.8 The way forward regarding predator control

*Power-point presentation by Prof. HO de Waal did not materialise should read '*As requested by Prof. HO De Waal, a PowerPoint presentation was made by him to the Steering Committee on 26 Aug 2015. The chairperson did not offer him another opportunity to make the presentation at this meeting.*'*

5.9 Municipal bylaws for stray dogs

The Eastern Cape resorted to the national body to assist in addressing the problem of stray dogs: (1) Gerhard Verdoorn and Lourens Goosen to write articles containing tips and advice; (2) To receive extract from Minutes from Agri EC – Natasha – Gerhard Verdoorn to request; and (3) Suggestion to write a letter to the SPCA – to rather channel it through the LWCC.

5.10 Communication

Bonita Francis briefly reported on efforts to communicate via PMF website, monthly newsletter and other sources of media.

6. RESEARCH PROJECTS

6.1 Predation research

The meeting took cognisance of research projects as contained in the annexure.

6.2 Scientific Assessment

According to Dr. Graham Kerley, DEA is still delaying the process, in that the Terms of Reference has only late in July 2015, been submitted to their legal department. Magdel Boshoff explained that DEA made a first payment according to the Terms of Reference, however the procurement of DEA is very strict and some problems were picked up in the legalities of documents between 2 entities. The MOU is in place and the TOR is specific for the Scientific Assessment.

Decision: Leon de Beer to write a letter to the researcher to enquire on progress. Awaiting a response.

6.3 Predator training

Neil Viljoen gave a brief overview of his training program for the past year. He highlighted the fact that fencing and electric fencing can be a huge advantage and bring about huge cost savings for farmers in the control of predators. Fencing provides a real solution to farmers.

Decision: (1) Report need to appear on website – good statistics; (2) Message regarding fences need to be capitulated in popular article - Landbouweekblad to contact Neil Viljoen; (3) Request for call to address meetings at Agri BIZ, to get fencing message

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

across as viable solution for predator control – emphasis be placed on job creation. Gerhard Verdoorn to discuss with John Purchase; and (4) Meeting was informed of decision by PMF Steering Committee to send Neil Viljoen and Lourens Goosen on a study tour to America in 2016. Will be funded by PMF industries.

6.4 Guard dogs as control method for predators

Dr. Gerhard Verdoorn to write article for the PMF website.

6.5 Strategic Planning document

Coligny Stegmann requested that strategic document be re-visited to see if the objectives and planning of PMF is still on track.

Decision: Bonita Francis to circulate document.

6.6 Free State Hunters Association

Daan Bodenstein required assistance with the following issues:

(1) Calling apparatus: Require more control in the selling of devices. Only trained and certified persons to be allowed to purchase apparatus.

Coligny Stegmann replied that control mechanism is not possible – the market should be the only control and fly by nights will be pushed from the market.

(2) Permission to apply predator control in nature reserves: Provincial legislation prohibits the control of predation in nature reserves, which seems to be a breeding ground for jackal. Only after 10 months were the Free State Hunters Association allowed to hunt.

Lourens Goosen said that the law prohibits it. Magdel Boshoff further indicated that DEA cannot force problems to provincial legislation.

Decision: PMF to draft a letter to Free State Dept. Environmental Affairs regarding concerns of Free State Hunting Assoc.

6.7 Fencing project

The Chairman reported on efforts with Government to subsidize fencing material. Prof. Beatrice Conradie, UCT is also busy driving a similar initiative.

Koning Scholtz, Northern Cape RPO enquired about the minimum standards for electrification. It is his experience that the configuration of some fences is not legal and he enquired what a person's right is in terms of such a dispute."

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMF Newsletter SEPTEMBER 2015[925]:

*"**New chairman for Predation Forum***

Guillau du Toit is the new chairman of the Predation Management Forum (PMF). He takes over from Harry Prinsloo, who served in this position for the past four years. The PMF represents the red meat, wool, mohair and wildlife industries at national level as well as officials from the Department of Agriculture Forestry and Fisheries (DAFF) and the Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA), national and provincial, who are invited to promote effective liaison on legislative matters.

A gentleman's agreement[926] between the NWGA and RPO provides a framework for woolgrowers to be responsible for predation matters and the RPO to attend to stock theft. For this reason, the chairmanship of the PMF lies with the NWGA.

During the PMF meeting, the establishment of a predation management information centre (PMIC) was accepted and the implementation and coordination of this will be Du Toit's first task. The PMIC will be responsible to design and maintain information relating

[925] PMF Newsletter SEPTEMBER 2015; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

[926] Editor's Note: In this regard, refer to correspondence on 22 June 1993, 5 July 1993, 13 July 1993 and 19 January 1994 between Mr. Nico Vermaak (Secretary: NPAPC) and Mr. Gerhard Schutte (General Manager: RPO).

Version 5.0 - HP de Waal - Version 5.0

to policies, legislation, best practices, and regulatory authorities, contact details of DCA specialists, accredited hunters, trappers, management services and tools. This centre will be used for information sharing and advice, receiving calls and e-mails from farmers, logging personal information and indicators, and activate specialist advisors to diagnose and mitigate."

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter SEPTEMBER 2015[927]:

"Illegal poisoning of wildlife on the increase

The recent death of vultures, blue cranes, brown hyena and other wildlife owing to illegal poisoning should be a wake-up call for South African conservation authorities, law enforcement agencies and conservationists. While rhinos are faced with a grave poaching threat, other equally important wildlife species, especially scavengers and predators are at risk of joining rhinos on the route of steep decline if the current spate of illegal poisoning continues."

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter SEPTEMBER 2015[928]:

"Quality and quantity of the scientific information available on black-backed jackals and caracals: contributing to human-predator conflict management?

Paper by Jurie du Plessis, Nico Avenant and HO de Waal reports on the scientific information available on the ecology of black-backed jackal and caracal to evaluate the nature of current knowledge of these species to prioritise research for the development of meaningful human-predator conflict management (HPCM) strategies.

Significant ecological questions, relevant to HPCM are highlighted in the study. These questions include:

1. Does black-backed jackal and caracal territoriality persist under rangeland conditions?

2. Have the two predators "learnt" to predate on introduced livestock or wildlife?

3. Has reproductive behaviour changed under rangeland conditions?

4. Is compensatory breeding observed under rangeland conditions?

Read here for full report:

http://www.pmfsa.co.za/images/news/1Scientific_info_Jackal_and_Caracal.pdf"

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMF Newsletter SEPTEMBER 2015[929]:

- **Vermin[930] training in Burgersdorp**
- The Burgersdorp study group arranged a vermin course for farmers and farm workers to control and curb predation. Therefore, Niël Viljoen addressed about 15 farmers and 28 farm workers on 25 Augustus at Roodepoort, the farm of Francois and Sunette du Toit, situated between Burgersdorp and Venterstad. The part on theory drew considerable attention. The calibration and practical setting of foothold trap were also demonstrated.
- Training is conducted in 1-day vermin courses. Since 2009 Niël conducted 193 courses with an attendance of 7 182 – 3 225 farmers and 3 957 farm workers.

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter SEPTEMBER 2015[931]:

"Ineffective system of permit issuing

The Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA) was informed that farmers are highly frustrated owing to the inconsistency in legislation between provincial conservation

[927] PMF Newsletter SEPTEMBER 2015; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[928] PMF Newsletter SEPTEMBER 2015; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[929] PMF Newsletter SEPTEMBER 2015; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[930] Editor's Note: despite concerted efforts to abolish vermin ('*ongedierte*') its use persisted even in the PMF.
[931] PMF Newsletter SEPTEMBER 2015; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 HO de Waal - version 5.0

departments. In the management of damage causing animals, a farmer could have more than one farm and be exposed to completely different approaches.

In a reply to the PMF, the director-general, Nosipho Ngcaba acknowledged that most of the damage farmers experienced involve caracal and black-backed jackal and that neither of the two species is regulated by the National Environmental Management: Biodiversity Act (Nemba) and the Threatened or Protected Species (Tops) regulations. The lawful use of specific methods is regulated in terms of provincial conservation legislation and the DEA has no jurisdiction over provincial legislation.

However, the DEA endeavoured to use the platform of an inter-governmental working group, which has the purpose of considering all legislative matters including the alignment of areas of conflict between the various provincial act and ordinances to address areas of concern regarding the management of damage causing animals."

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter JANUARY 2015[932]:

*"**Best practices for managing predation in South Africa***

Livestock farmers have a constitutional right and responsibility to take care of their animals and to protect them from all potential threats such as extreme weather conditions (cold, heat, droughts, fires etc.) as well as theft and predators. The framework focuses on the best ways to manage predation and this month we highlight preventative measures for predation management.

Electrical fencing

Electrical fencing can be useful but poses a danger to animals such as tortoises, pangolins and Cape monitors (likkewaans). The electric conductors should be installed in such a way that it would not trap or eventually electrocute these animals.

Install the earth conductor 10 cm above the ground to keep the mentioned animals away from the electrified fence. Install the first live conductor at a height of 20 cm above the ground.

2. Install the upper electric wire 15 cm above the ordinary fence.

3. Fences must be equipped with alarms that will sound as soon as an animal becomes entangled. These entrapped animals should be freed immediately. If they are injured, a veterinarian should these injuries and released afterwards.

4. Charges on the fences should not apply a lethal shock."

Pursuant to the information presented at the PMF meeting in Bloemfontein on 27 August 2015 by Dr. Gerhard Verdoorn on the "HUB" [name was later changed to read '*Management and Information Centre for Predation*'], a call was made on 10 November 2015 by the PMF to tertiary institutions for a "show of interest" to establish a predation management information centre. An excerpt of one such letter is quoted below:

"10 November 2015

CALL FOR EXPRESSION OF INTEREST

<u>Establishing a Predation Management Information Centre</u>

*The **Predation Management Forum of South Africa (PMF)** hereby calls on academic institutions with the appropriate profile, managerial skills, institutional capacity, human resource capacity, research expertise and infrastructure to submit an expression of interest in establishing a **Predation Management Information Centre (PMIC)** to service the needs of the PMF.*

GENERAL BRIEFING NOTES

[932] PMF Newsletter JANUARY 2014; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - Rhode Wahl - Version 5.0

The Predation Management Forum provides a platform for liaison and coordination of activities of commodity organisations in the livestock and game ranching sectors, aimed at reducing losses incurred as a result of predation by means of ecologically and ethically acceptable methods which protect the biodiversity of South Africa.

PMF members expressed the desire to have a coordination structure to ensure scientific, responsible and ecologically sustainable predation management in South Africa by establishing the Predation management Information Centre (PMIC).

The PIMC shall ideally be situated at an accredited academic/research institution with a department that that is well versed in the interface between agriculture and the natural environment with a team of staff (academic staff and students) that are able to manage requests for information and support on predation management from livestock and wildlife farmers.

The PMIC shall fulfil the role as the execution arm of the PMF and will act as conduit between farmers and: (1) state departments that regulate applicable legislation and support systems for wildlife management and biodiversity as well as agricultural production at the national and provincial levels; (2) PMF approved specialists that offer specific advice on all aspects of predation and predation management. In order to achieve these goals the PMIC will develop working relationships with applicable state departments or take over the existing PMF established liaison with state departments that are currently participating in the PMF. Data collection and collation, statistical analysis, development of prediction models, drafting of reports, and information resource management such as managing the PMF website and databases, and online information resources and close liaison with the PMF Steering Committee will also be key performance areas of the PMIC.

SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS

Institutions wishing to submit expressions of interest shall take note of the following:

- *Institutions must be accredited by the Department of Higher Education.*
- *The particular department must have expertise in ecological management and a good working understanding of the agricultural sector with particular emphasis on livestock/game management.*
- *A three year contract will entered into between the successful applicant (institution) and the National Woolgrowers Association (NWGA) as legal entity acting on behalf of the PMF. The contract will have performance clauses with a probationary period of three years. Should the successful institution perform satisfactory according the key performance areas identified in the contract, the PMF will consider extending the contract for another period as determined by itself.*
- *Applicants should submit a three year detailed budget and break it down into budget portion for the respective key performance areas as described in the detailed portfolio description.*

SUBMISSION OF EXPRESSION OF INTEREST

*Expression of interest shall be submitted on or before **29 January 2016** in writing via e-mail or hard copy to:*
The PMF Secretariat
C/o National Woolgrowers Association'

2016

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMF Newsletter JANUARY 2016[933]:

[933] PMF Newsletter JANUARY 2016; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - Hilo de Wadt Version 5.0

- **University of the Free State conduct study on predation in the wildlife ranching industry**
- The University of the Free State (UFS) has already conducted two studies to determine the economic effect of predation respectively on the small and large livestock industries. A third study by the UFS to determine the economic losses of predation in the wildlife ranching industry, commenced in October 2014.
- The focus of the study will be on the Limpopo Province, which is represent about 50% of the wildlife ranchers in the country and Limpopo has a diverse wildlife. It is more difficult to determine losses in the wildlife ranching industry because of the considerable range in wildlife species, values and management. In this study, the wildlife is divided in three groups, namely large game, small game and scares game. Direct and indirect cost of predation will be estimated for each group. The extent and level of predation, the factors effecting predation, as well as control methods will be investigated. Results will be published in the next Wildplaas issue.

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMF Newsletter JANUARY 2016[934]:

- **Effect of predation losses on the beef cattle industry**
- Hennie Maas of RSG talked on "Op die Veepos" to Prof HO de Waal of the Department of Animal, Wildlife and Grassland Sciences, University of the Free State about a study on the effect of predation losses on the beef cattle industry in South Africa. Listen at:
- http://www.pmfsa.co.za/images/mp3/predasie.mp3

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMF Newsletter JANUARY 2016[935]:

- **Cage trap for a solitary, old brown hyaena male**
- Yolandé Viljoen, residing about 50 km from Bloemfontein towards Jagersfontein, inquired about the 10 mature ewes of a neighbour that were almost completely devoured. She said only the heads and ribs remained. There were drag marks near the carcasses and the dead animals were found in less conspicuous spots in the tall grass, close to bushes. A head was found in a dense and overgrown part of the camp where the ewes have been grazing. There are large, round tracks, but it was destroyed by rain before it could be studied in detail. The neighbour grew up in the area and has never seen anything of this nature. Usually problems were only experienced from jackals and caracal.
- Dr Gerhard Verdoorn gave advise:
- Without doubt, a solitary, old brown hyaena male caught the sheep. He had long experience with hyaenas and usually they do not cause small livestock losses. Some old males become greedy and when they start killing sheep, they create a lot of damage.
- Fortunately, a brown hyaena can be trapped easily with a cage trap. Contact Lourens Goosen at Free State Environmental Affairs (telephone) or ask one of their officials to borrow a cage trap. They will also demonstrate how the cage trap should be set. Remains of a sheep or even chickens are good bait to trap a brown hyaena. When trapped, the animal may be moved to another area.

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter JANUARY 2016[936]:

> *"**Predator fencing support***
>
> *One of the most effective, non-lethal methods to decrease the effect of predators on livestock and wildlife, is the use of wire netting to protect livestock against predators, especially jackal. In the past, there were numerous initiatives to make wire netting*

[934] PMF Newsletter JANUARY 2016; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[935] PMF Newsletter JANUARY 2016; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[936] PMF Newsletter JANUARY 2016; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

available to producers at reduced prices in order to assist them in managing the disastrous effect of predation on livestock in South Africa.

The Predation Management Forum is approaching all national and local suppliers to consider similar initiatives, since fencing has become extremely costly, despite the fact that it proves to be one of the most successful, non-lethal methods of predator control and management."

On 29 January 2016, the UFS responded to the "CALL FOR EXPRESSION OF INTEREST" to establish a Predation Management Information Centre at the UFS and submitted a detailed letter of interest. The PMF Secretariat acknowledged "*receipt of the Free State's submission of an expression of interest to establish a PMIC*" on 29 January 2016 and stated "*The PMF Steering Committee is meeting on the 23rd of February, where after we will inform you of the outcome of your submission*."

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter FEBRUARY 2016[937]:

*"**Train for gain***

The National Woolgrowers' Association of SA (NWGA) started an integrated predation management programme in 2007. The NWGA's strategy for improving predation management in South Africa includes training farmers and farmworkers in predation management using monitor farms where best practice predation management is demonstrated. Since 2008, a total of 30 monitor farms have been used in South Africa, covering an area in excess of 155 000 ha. Statistics and data obtained from monitor farms show the following:

- *46% of all lamb mortalities are the result of predation.*
- *89% of all predation mortalities occur before weaning age.*
- *February to March and August to December are the most important predation periods.*
- *Proper integrated predation management results in a 50% decrease in predation losses.*

For the full article by Niel Viljoen, visit the PMF website -
http://www.pmfsa.co.za/images/news/Opleidingsprogram_2015_Wolboer.pdf"

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter FEBRUARY 2016[938]:

*"**Compensatory responses may undermine carnivore management efforts***

A recent research paper highlighted the importance of understanding the interactions between reserves and farms and is based on two years of jackal research from October 2011 to October 2013 in three conservation areas – the Karoo National Park, Mountain Zebra National Park and Addo Elephant National Park. It is the first time the response of jackal to lethal management has been quantified in South Africa, and it indicates that killing jackal is not effective without improving other management measures, notably fencing and hands-on management.

Journal of Applied Ecology 2015 – a paper by Liaan Minnie, Prof Graham Kerley, both from the Department of Zoology, Centre for African Conservation Ecology at the Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University, as well as Angela Gaylard from the Scientific Services Division at South African National Parks. For the full article, visit the PMF website:
http://www.pmfsa.co.za/images/news/Interactions_between_reserves_and_farms.pdf"

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter FEBRUARY 2016[939]:

[937] PMF Newsletter FEBRUARY 2016; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[938] PMF Newsletter FEBRUARY 2016; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[939] PMF Newsletter FEBRUARY 2016; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - PD de Waal - Version 5.0

" 'New approach needed to outfox costly predators' by Heather Dugmore, featured in Business Day:
http://www.bdlive.co.za/opinion/2016/02/08/new-approach-needed-to-outfox-costly-predators"

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMF Newsletter FEBRUARY 2016[940]:

- **Have you ever seen a jackal with mange? Tell us about it**
- It is generally known that mange is widespread among animals such as wildlife (game) and livestock. In the wool industry, mange is a serious and notifiable disease that farmers must be on the lookout for and treat in time to prevent serious economic losses. It is not clear if predators can also contract mange. Nevertheless, in Karoo and Limpopo black-backed jackals with mange have been observed.
- Dr. Gerhard Verdoorn, predator specialist, is inquiring from producers whether they have observed mange among black-backed jackals, and if indeed, send a short message in that regard to him. Mange may be one of nature's mechanisms to give the black-backed jackal population some beating. He is interested to determine the distribution of mange.
- Send observations or information to Dr. Gerhard Verdoorn at nesher@tiscali.co.za or phone (telephone) for more inquiries.

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter FEBRUARY 2016[941]:

*"**National training accreditation system***

The National Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA) is meeting with their provincial counterparts in the first week of March to discuss a national training accreditation system for predation training. Leon de Beer, general manager of the NWGA and Niel Viljoen, predator specialist, will attend the meeting. AgriSETA has accepted the NWGA's extension of scope application in recognition of the fact that the predation training course of Niel Viljoen has been accredited.

The main objective of the discussion is to establish a national training accreditation system by considering the minimum requirements for training of the provincial conservation authorities, as well as the SAQA requirements which adopts a unified approach. A list of accredited persons / institutions / hunters will be made available to farmers on the PMF website in order to eliminate unscrupulous and illegal services to farmers."

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter MARCH 2016[942]:

*"**Long-awaited assessment to commence***

After 14 months of getting the required paperwork in place and assessing issues raised by co-funders, the funding contract for having the Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University conduct a scientific assessment on predation-related matters has been concluded. Woolworths, Cape Wools SA, Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (DAFF), SA Mohair Trust, as well as the Department of Environmental Affairs are the co-funders of the project, which aims to conduct strategically determined research, taking into account the problems and needs of the livestock industry, the various environmental (ecological) requirements and research needs.

Assessment is scheduled to be concluded in 2018 and the outcome of the assessment will provide sound, science-based guidelines to mitigate problems caused by predation, especially by jackal and caracal."

[940] PMF Newsletter FEBRUARY 2016; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[941] PMF Newsletter FEBRUARY 2016; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[942] PMF Newsletter MARCH 2016; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - Hoede Vaal - Versie 5.0

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter MARCH 2016[943]:

*"**Predation management information centre high on agenda***

At a recent meeting of the Predation Management Forum, the discussion of the tender applications for a Predation Management Information Centre (PMIC) took precedence over other matters. The Red Meat Research and Development SA (RMRD SA), the research structure for the red meat industry, is the official mechanism for predation research and the two tender applications will be evaluated and a recommendation made to the PMF.

The framework for a predation management manual was accepted and Agri Connect will be responsible for drawing up, printing and distributing the manual. It will serve as a marketing tool at functions, road shows, courses, etc. and is seen as adding value to farming enterprises.

The efforts by the PMF to approach national and local suppliers to investigate initiatives for providing cheaper fencing were discussed and encouraged. Leon de Beer was tasked to proceed with further negotiations.

From left[944]: Thomas Mbedzi (DEA), Guillau du Toit (PMF & NWGA chairman), Petrie Maré (SAMGA), Coligny Stegmann (SAMGA), Lardus van Zyl (RPO), Leon de Beer (NWGA), Karen Grobler (Agri Connect), Eardly Rudman (WRSA) and Magdel Boshoff (DEA)."

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMF Newsletter MARCH 2016[945]:

- **How do you catch a caracal in the Overberg?**
- Willem Coetzee needed advice on a caracal that caused havoc among his lambs in the Overberg.
- Dr. Gerhard Verdoorn explained how to catch a caracal:
  - Get a caracal cage trap; enquire among the neighbours or somebody else to borrow it if you do not have a cage trap yourself.
  - Clean the cage trap well with boiling water, especially the stepping plate mechanism.
  - Try to set the caracal cage trap where the animal moves around, especially if its walking path can be located. The cage trap must be placed next to the walking path. Do not place any cover over the cage trap.
  - Put bait such as carcass remains of a lamb that was killed at the back in the cage.
  - Make a small ball of aluminium foil the size of a tennis ball and hang with a piece of wool it in the middle of the cage.
  - Try to get the urine of a domesticated cat, such as the sand contained in a sand box used by people for their cats. Sprinkle it on the floor of the cage trap.
  - Use the entrails such as sheep liver and create drag marks from about 100 m in different directions to the cage trap.
  - Put the liver also in the cage trap.
  - Inspect the cage trap early every morning to see if a caracal has been trapped.
- Contact Dr. Verdoorn (telephone) for more inquiries.

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMF Newsletter MARCH 2016[946]:

- **Be warned – 1080 is not necessarily legal!**
- Sodium monofluoroacetate (Compound 1080) is a hazardous substance, regulated by the Act on Hazardous Substances (Act 15 of 1973). It is a schedule 1, category A-hazardous substance subjected to certain requirement of the Act. If a person wants to trade with 1080, a

[943] PMF Newsletter MARCH 2016; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[944] Editor's Note: caption to a photograph.
[945] PMF Newsletter MARCH 2016; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[946] PMF Newsletter MARCH 2016; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 H.O. de Waal - Version 5.0

licence must be obtained according to the Act: an official of the Department of Health must issue such a licence.

- The only application of 1080 that is authorised by the Act is the poison collar. No other use of 1080 is authorised by the Act.
- Regarding the use of 1080 to control damage-causing animals, other restrictions also apply to 1080, in addition to the requirements of Act 15 of 1973. All provincial conservation and hunting ordinances state the use of any poison to kill animals as a prohibited activity unless an appropriate permit has been obtained for its use.
- Thus, although the Department of Health may issue a license to somebody to sell 1080, the buyer is still responsible to obtain the necessary permit to use 1080 in whatever way; be it in the poison collar or in whatever type of bait. Therefore, if somebody bought 1080 bait without the necessary permit for its use, the person is accountable according to the provincial conservation ordinance. It is known that 1080 bait is sold by certain agricultural businesses; none has a license to sell it and they therefore trade illegally with a schedule 1, category A-hazardous substance.

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMF Newsletter MARCH 2016[947]:

- **Anatolian dogs for farmers in KZN**
- At a meeting of the KwaZulu-Natal Predation Management Forum in February 2016, Deon Cilliers of Cheetah Outreach announced a programme where dogs would be transferred countrywide to farmers, subject to specific conditions. Farmers will be guided for a year in the handling of the dogs, where after the dogs will be donated to the farmers. Five dogs have already been offered in this programme to farmers in KwaZulu-Natal.
- The results thus far include:
  - On all farms, livestock losses were decreased between 90% and 100%.
  - All other forms of control by farmers was stopped on all farms in the programme.
  - His recommendations included:
  - Identify the dog that is suitable for your livestock.
  - Buy your dog from an approved breeder.
  - Obtain advice and support from an expert to guide you during the first year.
  - Pups must be between seven and 12 weeks old.
  - Use the dog first in a kraal or in extensive grazing camps.
  - Allow a bonding period of six to eight weeks.
  - Expose the dog to the rest of the flock.
  - Identify behavioural problems.
  - The must have minimal contact with people, but 24-hour contact with livestock.
  - At first, do not place the dog with any young lambs.
- Cheetah Outreach is fulltime represented in the North West and Limpopo and busy with pilot projects in the Western Cape and Free State. The success of the programme is linked to the provision of support to farmers in all stadia of the process. For further inquiries regarding the programme contact Deon Cilliers (telephone) or cheetah@intekom.co.za.

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter MARCH 2016[948]:

> ***"Accreditation of predation management training***
>
> *The Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA) published draft norms and standards for the management of damage-causing animals in South Africa, for public participation in 2011. The draft norms and standards propose that persons must be adequately trained to use methods for the management of predators for which permits are required.*

[947] PMF Newsletter MARCH 2016; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[948] PMF Newsletter MARCH 2016; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

The PMF has requested the DEA to consider issuing permits to professional predation managers (as required by legislation) who have successfully completed the predation management course presented by Niel Viljoen. The course was officially revised to be aligned with related unit standards of the SA Qualifications Authority (SAQA).

A meeting was consequently arranged for 1 March 2016 in Pretoria to discuss this matter and was at-tended by representatives of provincial conservation authorities, as well as Leon de Beer and Niel Viljoen representing the PMF. Magdel Boshoff from DEA chaired the meeting and the following recommendations were made for consideration by DEA and provincial conservation authorities:

1. Niel Viljoen's course should be the benchmark and should set the minimum standard for course content for course attendees meeting the requirements of the course assessment, who should then be issued with permits.

2. A general introductory course on predation management should be presented to all farmers, farmworkers, extension officers, trainers, etc. interested in predation management training before specialising in various control methods.

3. A specialist course should be presented and attended by persons who have successfully completed the general course. This course should be aimed at training specialists on the various management tools as appropriate, i.e. "call and shoot", leg-holding devices, cages and all other methods that will require a permit as specified by legislation.

4. Experienced persons in predation management (i.e. trainers, hunters, trappers, etc.) without any proof of a recognised training qualification may be afforded an assessment in Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL) to qualify for specialist training without the requirement to complete an introductory course.

5. DEA and provincial conservation authorities should consider and approve trainers and training institutions at their own discretion for the purpose of meeting permit requirements.

6. This course will not replace the existing training capacity within the respective departments, but will be in support of and add needed capacity to train interested parties to required levels of competency.

7. DEA and provincial conservation authorities should consider accepting the outcome of the specialist course in any province."

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMF Newsletter APRIL 2016[949]:

- **Cheaper mesh wire**
- The Predation Management Forum (PMF) expressed appreciation to Die Koöperasie at Humansdorp for making mesh wire available at reduced prices to livestock farmers and wildlife ranchers. It was an initiative of the PMF to approach all national and local cooperatives to make mesh wire available at reduced price. Johan du Plessis, General Manager Commerce at Die Koöperasie, said it was a privilege to be involved in this initiative.
- The prices and procedures to order mesh wires are available on the PMF website - http://www.pmfsa.co.za/item/238-goedkoper-ogiesdraad
- Special thanks to Die Koöperasie who would donate 1% of the value of orders received to predation management training.

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter APRIL 2016[950]:

*"**Clarity on research – jackal can persist despite control efforts***

Prof. Graham Kerley, Distinguished Professor (Zoology) & Director of the Centre for African Conservation Ecology at Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University (NMMU)

[949] PMF Newsletter APRIL 2016; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[950] PMF Newsletter APRIL 2016; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

provided clarity on the publication "Compensatory life-history responses of a mesopredator may undermine carnivore management efforts" by Minnie, Gaylard and Kerley, which was published in the Journal of Applied Ecology.

An abstract from the publication states:

"The lethal management of predators is the prevailing strategy to reduce livestock predation. However, the highly adaptable nature of jackal and the combination of compensatory mechanisms such as increased reproduction and the potential for immigration allow these predators to persist in the face of severe anthropogenic mortality, possibly through the formation of a source-sink system."

This statement in the publication was viewed by some producers and certain members of the PMF "as a way to blame farmers that they are responsible for the predation problem (especially jackal) on their farms".

As Prof. Kerley explains:

1) Despite the efforts of farmers to control jackal, jackal are able to persist on farms.

2) This persistence may be due to the ability of jackals to increase reproduction and/or breed at a younger age and to disperse (move).

3) Researchers also hypothesise that this persistence may in part be due to the movement of jackal from areas with higher population densities (sources) to areas where jackal are controlled and hence have low population densities (sinks).

Point (1) is not a new finding and is in fact the reason for the ongoing problem. Point (2) emerges from this study as a partial explanation for point (1). Point (3) is a testable hypothesis which arises from these findings, and which provides for a very useful, regional perspective of the issues around jackal management.

Based on the above, a more useful interpretation of the publication would be to recognise that there is now some biological/scientific evidence (as opposed to opinion) as to how jackal can persist despite control efforts. Furthermore, our hypothesis on the importance of the movement of jackal provides an important and testable extension of the required management focus beyond the traditional farm-specific management of jackal.

So instead of being seen as blaming farmers for the problem, what this source-sink idea does is to provide a rationale to bring farmers, reserve managers and other land use managers (e.g. game ranchers and forestry managers) together to develop a collective and regional approach to managing jackal.

Emerging from this publication is the idea that jackal management is a collective regional issue. This idea is not explicitly stated in this publication, as that would be beyond the scope of the publication.

It is therefore clear that our research findings have considerable relevance to the PMF and the broader communities represented therein. This also emphasises the need to provide more effective mechanisms for communicating science to the various stakeholders, as well as to decision-makers. We remain committed to serving in this role, within our available capacity, in addition to our primary role: producing high-quality science and expertise."

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter APRIL 2016[951]:

"NWGA Congress focuses on predation

Predation management will be high on the agenda of the 2016 Wool Growers' Annual Congress, which takes place on 1 and 2 June in Port Elizabeth. The Minister of Environmental Affairs, Edna Molewa, has been invited to speak on the topic: "Livestock predation: How do Environmental Affairs & Agriculture partner to prevent predation?"

[951] PMF Newsletter APRIL 2016; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 – HO de Waal – Version 5.0

Prof. Graham Kerley of the NMMU will present the scientific assessment, which aims to conduct strategically determined research, taking into account the problems and needs of the livestock industry, various environmental (ecological requirements) and research needs. Niel Viljoen, predation specialist, will convey the results of the NWGA's integrated predation management programme, which has been running since 2007. This research includes training farmers and farm workers in predation management, using monitor farms where best practice predation management is demonstrated. Karen Grobler of Agri Connect will conclude the predation session with the launch of the Predation Management Manual."

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMF Newsletter APRIL 2016[952]:

- **Black black-backed jackals?? Is it a colour variant or what?**
- The recent request by Dr. Gerhard Verdoorn, Independent Adviser to the Predation Management Forum to livestock farmers and hunters to report information regarding possible mange[953] among black-backed jackals, drew wide reaction. Mange or scabies, caused by sarcoptic mites, is a serious condition especially when affecting wool sheep. In days past, it was so serious that government deployed special inspectors to visit farms and enforce dip programmes. The Karoo was dipped "tame" with the old arsenic dip substances and one can only wonder what else has been sacrificed in the process. Later, less hazardous dip remedies were used and currently several dip remedies are available to effectively control the mites, with little risk to the natural environment.
- Amazingly, reports from all quarters in South Africa indicated mange among jackals. In the far north, jackals were noted with hairless tails and the rumps were devoid of much hair. In the Karoo farmers and hunters reported frequent encounters or killing of serious mange jackals. From the Eastern Cape, good photographs were received of mange jackals in the Addo area as far east as Grahamstown. Mange jackals were also noted in the Kalahari, which is interesting because the perception is that the Kalahari is spared such pests.
- There is a possible reason for the occurrence of mange among jackals, namely when a population increase excessively, it puts the species under stress and natural elements such as diseases may reduce the population. Farmers in the Karoo know that dassie[954] multiply until Verreaux's eagles[955] also have no effect on the population size and then suddenly a virus hit the dassie and decimate them. Can this also happen with black-backed jackals? Verdoorn holds the view it could happen: he hunts near Mapungubwe on a reserve with a healthy ecology, including black-backed jackals. In 2005, black-backed jackals became so abundant that the owners requested him to reduce the population. He convinced them to persist until the winter of 2006 and the mange hit the population with severe consequences. He was amazed to see virtually no jackals without mange. However, there were also some impala with some loss of hair, but with no mortalities while the jackals looked like a new black colour variant!
- One wonders if diseases such as mange may at a stage give the black-backed jackals in livestock farming areas a real knock. Ecologically it make sense but it remains to be seen. The photograph by Louis Meaker of a mange jackal is something livestock farmers should look for and report if noted. For more inquiries contact Dr. Gerhard Verdoorn (telephone) or nesher@tiscali.co.za

Confidential verbal feedback from sources suggested the NMMU had been asked to establish a Predation Management Information Centre. A considerable period lapsed during which no formal feedback was received from the PMF. Apparently, the wording used in the PMF's letter of 10 November 2015 has created considerable confusion. Clearly, there is a distinct difference

[952] PMF Newsletter APRIL 2016; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[953] Editor's Note: Sarcoptic Mange ('brandsiekte')
[954] Editor's Note: rock hyraxes.
[955] Editor's Note: 'witkruisarende'

Version 5.0 - Pieter de Waal - Version 5.0

between a tender and merely calling to show intent. Ostensibly, a perceived slowing down of meaningful progress with the process made planning difficult. To assist and make it easier for the PMF Secretariat in its further proceedings, the UFS recommended on 15 April 2016 that it is not necessary to provide any more documents regarding a tender process. The underlying objective of the advice to the PMF Secretariat was to resolve the unintended confusion created by the letter of 10 November 2015 and happenings since. On 18 April 2016 the PMF Chairman Mr. Guillau du Toit responded and stated that the submissions have been referred to the RMRD SA for evaluation with an apology for him been abroad on official business and not informing the UFS about the delay in the process. It later transpired the RMRD SA had provided its recommendations to the PMF Secretariat in a letter dated 4 April 2016. Ostensibly the RMRD SA recommended that the two institutions which showed interest were both eligible to be considered by the PMF to participate further in proceeding.

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMF Newsletter MAY 2016[956]:

- **Are you using herd protecting animals?**
- Jolandie Botha, Masters Student of the Faculty of Veterinary Science at the University of Pretoria asked farmers to cooperate and submit a short questionnaire to determine the factors leading to success or failure in controlling livestock losses. Farmers with two or more years' experience in using donkeys, alpacas or herd protecting dogs to protect the livestock from black-backed jackals and caracal was requested to participate. Please contact Jolandie (telephone) or Jolandie.botha@imalivest.co.za

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMF Newsletter MAY 2016[957]:

- **Jackals with mange are widespread**
- Since the first report regarding the possibility of mange among jackals was posted by the PMF, information was received from several quarters from farmers and hunters. Reports, some with photographs as illustration, were received from among other the Karoo (Sutherland, Fraserburg, Brandvlei, Beaufort West), North West (Barkly West), Limpopo (Vaalwater, Alldays), southern KwaZulu-Natal, Eastern Cape (Addo, Cradock) and southern Free State.
- At Alldays, the back quarters and tail of almost all the jackals that were observed or shot was without hair and pitch black. At Barkly West, eight from 10 jackals shot were severely affected by mange, while people from other regions reported that many mange jackals were observed.
- To date no reports regarding mange among game, domesticated livestock and even other predators such as bat-eared foxed and aardwolves. It thus appears that jackals are now the target of the mange mites. Whether mange will knock the jackal population in a major way remains to be seen, but many farmers would welcome it.
- Another question put to farmers was if they observed that jackals have hybridised with domesticated dogs. There are people that allege it is the case and even photographs suggesting evidence, but is it possible? If such occurrence was noted, please report it to the PMF Secretariat (telephone) or nwga@nwga.co.za or Dr. Gerhard Verdoorn (telephone) or nesher@tiscali.co.za.

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter MAY 2016[958]:

> *"**Good attendance at Eastern Cape PMF***
>
> *The Eastern Cape PMF, chaired by the new chairperson of EC-NWGA, HB van der Walt, hosted their meeting on 11 May 2016. The forum was well attended by all the relevant role players. One of the main issues that was discussed was the standarisation*

[956] PMF Newsletter MAY 2016; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[957] PMF Newsletter MAY 2016; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[958] PMF Newsletter MAY 2016; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - Nico de Waal - Version 5.0

of hunting permits. A letter will again be sent to the Department of Economic Development and Environmental Affairs (DEDEA). The Strategy for control of damage-causing leopards has been finalised and will be forwarded to DEDEA and Stakeholders in the Eastern Cape Safari Industry Committee (SECSIECOM) for further attention.

Dennis Rawlings from Nighteye introduced his invention to the forum. The product is placed on the sheep's head, signalling different colours to distract predators. Niel Viljoen gave feedback on the farms being monitored, which has proven to be a huge success. His training courses are still in high demand. Kate Webster from Vulpro informed the forum that, due to the current low food supplies, vultures are turning to livestock for food. She encouraged land and livestock owners to establish restaurants supplying safe food for the vultures."

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter MAY 2016[959]:

*"**Vultures as problem animals for livestock***

Vultures do not normally attack livestock for their food supply. However, reports have been received of livestock losses due to vultures attacking live animals. This can be ascribed to the following:

• as a result of better agricultural practices fewer 'natural' mortalities occur in agriculture, resulting in less food available for vultures to consume;

• in the traditional homeland areas all livestock is kraaled every night to keep predators and stock thieves away, which indirectly also results in better animal management.

Vultures, especially the juvenile and immature groups of birds, are therefore under tremendous pressure to find food. They have been seen attacking stock that is still alive, especially weak, sick animals or animals battling to calve, lamb or kid. It is for this reason that PMF encourages landowners to establish restaurants supplying safe food for these birds as they play a vital role in the ecosystem.

When putting out food for vultures one can overcome the possibility of them "attacking" livestock, as well as assisting in the survival of our vultures in Africa. However, safe food is vitally important. Please note that stock treated with NSAID drugs, or that have been euthanised or died after being darted, could potentially kill the vultures.

Should you require any assistance on how to go about operating a vulture restaurant, which medications are harmful to vultures or if you are unsure as to what constitutes 'safe' food for vultures, consult the following experts:

Dr Gerhard Verdoorn (Griffon Poison Information Centre) (telephone) nesher@tiscali.co.za

Kerri Wolter (Vulpro) (telephone) kerri@gmail.com

Kate Webster (Vulpro Eastern Cape) (telephone) kate@lcom.co.za

PLEASE NOTE: Should you establish a restaurant, please inform Vulpro and provide the following details:

• name of landowner (restaurant operator);

• name of the property;

• coordinates of the site;

• contact details; and

• any other information you deem necessary.

This will be included on our database and the restaurant newsletter will be forwarded to you."

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMF Newsletter JUNE 2016[960]:

[959] PMF Newsletter MAY 2016; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[960] PMF Newsletter JUNE 2016; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - PhD de Vival - Version 5.0

- **Progress: norms and standards**
- Magdel Boshoff of the Department of Environmental Affairs communicated that the norms and standards regarding the management of damage-causing animals ("Norms and standards for the management of damage-causing animals in South Africa") is currently with the Minister for approval to republish it for public comments. As soon as the norms and standards have been published in the Government Gazette, the PMF Secretariat will be informed regarding the process to be followed by interested parties to submit comments in the monthly PMF Newsletter and the PMF website.

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter JUNE 2016[961]:

> ***"DAFF and DEA pledge commitment to the advancement of scientific assessment***
>
> *The Scientific Assessment of Predation was officially launched at the annual congress of the National Woolgrowers' Association earlier this month. Alf Wills, the Deputy Director-General of the Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA), speaking on behalf of his Minister, said that the Predation Management Forum was an important cross-sectoral platform between Government and industry. The first step towards establishing a formal partnership under the draft National Biodiversity Research and Evidence Strategy had been the introduction of a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between DEA and the Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University (NMMU) stating that they would collaborate on matters of interest. The Scientific Assessment on Predation Management, led by the Cooperative Research Programme of the University, was identified as a priority for both Government and industry. The assessment aimed to benchmark scientifically and legally sound decision-making and policy development. Wills emphasised the DEA's commitment to this programme and was pleased to launch the scientific assessment, which was a step forward in tackling the important issue of predation.*
>
> *Mandla Lukhele from the Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (DAFF) applauded the efforts of the NWGA in helping develop emerging farmers, and endorsed the efforts of the Predation Management Forum (PMF) to provide evidence-based research towards drawing up policies based on the scientific assessment. DAFF contributed R250 000 towards the assessment and was looking forward to the outcome."*

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter JUNE 2016[962]:

> ***"How to simplify and continuously improve predation management***
>
> *Niel Viljoen conducts predation management training programmes. According to him the key to predation management leading to the biggest success is ISOLATION.*
>
> *1. A block of farms/one farm/part of a farm/lambing camps are isolated units.*
> *2. An isolated block keeps unwanted predators outside of the isolated area.*
> *3. Managing isolation is easier than managing predators.*
> *4. Man-made isolated blocks in nature alter the natural pathways of predators.*
> *5. Isolated blocks force predators to use identifiable pathways through the isolation.*
> *6. These identifiable pathways simplify the management of unwanted predators.*
> *7. The correct management of isolation ensures that only unwanted predators will be removed.*
> *8. Simplifying your predation management programme means less losses, less stress, less time consumed and more money in the bank."*

[961] PMF Newsletter JUNE 2016; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[962] PMF Newsletter JUNE 2016; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - Model Meat - Version 5.0

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter JUNE 2016[963]:

*"**Legal use of control by means of poison***

Questions posed to Dr Gerhard Verdoorn about the legal aspects of controlling vermin by means of poison:

1. The use of registered poison for vermin control

The toxic collar, containing compound 1080, is the only chemical that is registered and currently available. It is supplied by Eddie Steenkamp. Although the coyote getter ("gifskieter") is also considered legal (it uses sodium cyanide), it is currently not available and farmers would have to undergo training and certification when it does become available. Any other use of 1080 or sodium cyanide is illegal.

2. The use of unregistered poison for vermin control, i.e. METHOMYL and CURATERR (the active ingredient is carbonate).

The use of any pesticides like carbofurane, aldicarb or methomyl (all carbamates) is illegal, not only in terms of conservation legislation but also in terms of Act 36 of 1947. This prohibition is also contained in the document on best practices."

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMF Newsletter JUNE 2016[964]:

- **Boost for predation training**
- This week, Die Koöperasie, with its head office at Humansdorp, handed a cheque of R45 000 to the PMF as a contribution to curb predation. Die Koöperasie donated 1% of the value of orders received for jackal-proof mesh (which could be ordered since April at drastically reduced prices countrywide from Die Koöperasie) towards predation management training.
- According to Johan du Plessis, commercial manager of Die Koöperasie, the mesh provided by the project to producers is manufactured by Barnes Fencing in Johannesburg and complies with high quality standards. The mesh is definitely not imported from China. Barnes Fencing's products are registered with the South African Bureau of Standards (SABS) with the SANS 675 and SANS 10244 marks. The physical and mechanical characteristics of the mesh products are measured meticulously to meet these standards. The SABS also inspect the mesh regularly as quality control during the manufacturing process.
- Guillau du Toit, chairman of the Predation Management Forum (PMF), expressed his appreciation towards Die Koöperasie for the initiative to support predation management training. Erecting of jackal-proof mesh is currently one of the more effective non-lethal control methods to reduce the damage caused by jackals. Du Toit also expressed his thanks towards BKB and OVK, for providing the mesh at reduced prices to producers and said he hoped that other input providers would follow suit.

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMF Newsletter JUNE 2016[965]:

- **Cooperation needed regarding jackals with mange**
- The Eastern Cape Animal Health Forum requested that if jackals are shot and suspected it has mange; please provide the carcass to the nearest state veterinarian for analysis. The cooperation of farmers and hunters is requested to determine the extent of mange among jackals.

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMF Newsletter JUNE 2016[966]:

- **It sounds like a brown hyaena, but is it a jackal?**

[963] PMF Newsletter JUNE 2016; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[964] PMF Newsletter JUNE 2016; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[965] PMF Newsletter JUNE 2016; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[966] PMF Newsletter JUNE 2016; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

- Ben Erasmus inquired about a brown hyaena that make a loud call in the night, which sounds like a jackal. According to him, brown hyaenas only utter growls.
- Dr. Gerhard Verdoorn responded:
- "*The brown hyaenas definitely do not make any loud call sounds. At their communal dens, there is an" ê-ê-ê-ê" sound when a dominant female pulls her rank. The subordinates mostly utter it. The animals also make deep growling sounds, especially when they are aggressive and confronted, but it does not travel far.*
- *The sounds Ben refer to could have been the call of a Cape fox, which sounds very similar to a black-backed jackal. It is a loud call which travels far, but is not generally heard." Gerhard often heard the sounds in the Kalahari where Cape foxes were abundant. The side-striped jackal*[967] *that occur in the wetter eastern areas of South Africa also has a loud call but is heard less often*.
- Visit the website of the Predation Management Forum (PMF) www.pmfsa.co.za and direct all inquiries directly to Dr. Gerhard Verdoorn – independent specialist via the "Ask the Expert" function.

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter JULY 2016[968]:

> ***Predators on private land: Broad-scale socioeconomic interactions affect large predator management***
>
> *A paper recently published by Prof. Graham Kerley deals with the issue of predator management on private reserves. The issue of sustainable predator densities is of particular interest. Kerley and colleagues assessed the area requirements for lion and cheetah, and also put this in perspective in terms of the policy guidelines.*
>
> *Evidence showed that lions tend to be stocked sustainably (in terms of the available prey base), whereas cheetah tended to be overstocked in 75% of the properties. Furthermore, the evidence indicates that none of these properties were able to support a single cheetah on the minimum area of 1 000 ha as provided for in the then relevant Eastern Cape Certificate for Adequate Enclosure (CAE) policy. Visit the PMF website to download the study or click on this link http://www.pmfsa.co.za/images/news/Kerley.pdf*"

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMF Newsletter JULY 2016[969]:

- **Is there a remedy for mange?**
- With reference to an article in the Landbouweekblad regarding mange jackals, Lizaan Smit inquired if there was a remedy available for mange.
- Dr. Gerhard Verdoorn of the PMF's "Vra die Expert" fame responded that different mites cause mange among different animals. Mange is not a virus or bacterial disease for which there is antidote or vaccine. When mange mites do occur among livestock, animals can be treated with a large range of dip remedies. Visit www.saaha.co.za and open the "Oxpecker chart". Currently, there are 43 remedies registered to treat animals for mange mites.
- "*To date there is no report of mange among livestock or antelope, apparently only the jackals are currently affected*", said Verdoorn.

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter JULY 2016[970]:

> *"**Stop trying to outsmart and fight predators!***
>
> *At the most recent NWGA National Congress, Niel Viljoen, predator specialist, said that significant successes had been achieved over the past eight years in dealing with predators while working together with the NWGA and farmers throughout South Africa.*

[967] *Canis adustus* (Witkwasjakkals)
[968] PMF Newsletter JULY 2016; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[969] PMF Newsletter JULY 2016; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[970] PMF Newsletter JULY 2016; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 – Not the final version 5.0

This was not a result of outsmarting or fighting the predators, but rather of understanding the situation, adapting the system and managing the problem. In the animal kingdom the ability to change and continuously adapt to forever changing situations and circumstances is the key factor to securing the survival of a species.

Initially, Viljoen's goals were to assist farmers in managing predators, thereby contributing to the global production of wool, meat and mohair. He wanted to change the overall picture of the industry from the farm right through to the end of production lines. He wanted to create a better understanding among activists, consumers, customers, retailers and the fashion industry by explaining the current positive approach to predators and predation, and the results of this approach. In order to achieve this he needed to shift perceptions and the general focus on how to engage with predation. The graph below explains this point.

From predator management →	***To predation management***
Contractors in charge	*Farmers in charge*
Contractors used when needed	*Continuous management by farmer*
Only lethal methods	*Using the toolbox to full extent*
Reaction after losses hunting jackal and caracal	*Proactive management strategies*
Time consuming	*Time well spent*
Temporary relief	*Constant relief*
costly	*Cost-effective"*

On 20 July 2016, Prof. Frikkie Neser received an e-mail from the PFM Secretariat requesting a meeting on 25 July 2016 with Mr. Guillau du Toit, PMF Chairman. The objective was to discuss the Predation Management Information Centre and the involvement of the UFS. The meeting at the UFS on 25 July 2016 with Mr. Guillau du Toit was attended by Prof. Danie Vermeulen (Dean: Faculty of Natural and Agricultural Sciences), Prof. Frikkie Neser (Head: Department of Animal, Wildlife and Grassland Sciences), Dr. Antonie Geyer (Programme Director: Agriculture), Prof. HO de Waal (UFS/ALPRU) and Mr. Walter van Niekerk (UFS, PhD candidate). After due deliberation, it was decided the UFS must submit a revised letter for consideration by the PMF Steering Committee at its meeting on 23 August 2016.

A revised letter was submitted by the UFS on 26 July 2016 to the PMF Chairman to "*confirm our interest to assume responsibility and establish a PMC as broadly outlined in your letter, terms of reference and attached documents.*" It was also stated that the group at the UFS did not step away from the PMF, but merely gave it space to resolve the issue. No adjustments were made to the budget, which would be submitted at the PMF meeting.

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMF Newsletter AUGUST 2016[971]:

- **Possible cause for mange jackals**
- Dr. Roy Bengis, a retired veterinarian and well known for his service in the National Kruger Park, supported the view of Dr. Gerhard Verdoorn that the current black-backed jackal population has increased to such an extent that the population is stressed, causing the outbreak of sarcoptic mites among jackals. At the Breslau Reserve near Pont Drift on the banks of the Limpopo River (close to Mapungubwe) a kudu cow and two impala showed mild signs of mange. According to Dr. Verdoorn, jackals with mange were also observed. There is no further reports of mange elsewhere (July 2016).

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMF Newsletter AUGUST 2016[972]:

- **Handy manual on predation management**

[971] PMF Newsletter AUGUST 2016; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[972] PMF Newsletter AUGUST 2016; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 – HO Avenant – Version 5.0

- The Predation Management Forum (PMF) recently released a comprehensive manual on integrated predation management. The guidelines are a one-stop guide to help producers to identify the predator problem on their farms, as well as the best way to manage it, within the framework of provincial and national legislation.
- Guillau du Toit, PMF chairman, said the manual is the culmination of work done by the PMF, the expert advisers Dr. Gerhard Verdoorn and Niël Viljoen, and the PMF Secretariat.
- "*The PMF aims to assist producers with ecological compatible predation management. Since its founding, the PMF promoted the principle of integrated predation management where all aspects of ecological management, herd management, preventative and remedial actions are interwoven to bring predation losses at an acceptable level.*"
- Du Toit said to succeed in the battle against predators it is necessary for farmers, farm managers, farm workers and neighbours jointly strive to understand the processes of nature and keep informed about predator movement on the farm.
- "*Integrated predation management includes a comprehensive toolbox comprising preventative and remedial control methods; therefore, it is important to take note of the legal methods to achieve success*."
- "*I trust this manual would empower every livestock owner with the necessary knowledge to act responsibly by applying the best available practices to curb losses and increase profitability*."
- An electronic format of the manual is available on the NWGA website. For more information on the manual, contact Bonita Francis at NWGA Head Office in in Port Elizabeth.

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMF Newsletter AUGUST 2016[973]:

- **Looking for Karoo farmers to help with predation research**
- Farmers of Merweville, Prins Albert, Leeu-Gamka, Murraysburg, Sutherland, Fraserburg, Beaufort West, Loxton and Victoria West are requested to assist the PhD student, Marine Drouilly, in collecting important information to determine the behaviour of jackals, caracal and baboons. The short questionnaire required for farmers to complete forms part of the Karoo Predation Project conducted in cooperation with the University of Cape Town. The larger the database of the study, the better the conclusions. It improves the chances of sustainable solutions and funding to address this important problem in the area.
- The Predation Management Forum supports the research on sustainable extensive livestock farming and call on farmers to participate in the initiative. Participating farmers can contact Marine Drouilly (telephone) or marinedrouilly@gmail.com.

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter AUGUST 2016[974]:

> *"**Shepherding back our biodiversity project***
>
> *A representative of the PMF has been invited to attend a stakeholder meeting on 18 August 2016 aimed at initiating the "Shepherding Back our Biodiversity" project in Beaufort West. The project is co-financed extensively, and the Global Environmental Facility (GEF) and the Green Fund are some of the significant supporters of the project. The project is supported through the GEF6 Operational Focal Point of the Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA), under whose jurisdiction and direction the meeting will be held. The Landmark Foundation will implement the project and act as the secretariat of the stakeholders' meetings through a contract with the United Nations Environmental Programme (UNEP).*
>
> *The objective of the project is to foster biodiversity conservation on livestock farms by returning to human shepherding and the development of a wildlife-friendly produce-branding scheme, leading to Payment for Ecosystem Services (PES) as a tool in*

[973] PMF Newsletter AUGUST 2016; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[974] PMF Newsletter AUGUST 2016; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - 110 de Waal - Version 5.0

conservation and local economic development. The project will have a main learning site in Nelspoort in the Beaufort West district."

The PMF meeting was held on 24 August 2016 in the Board Room Agriculture Building, UFS in Bloemfontein. Excerpts of the minutes are quoted below:

*"Present: **NGWA** - Guillau du Toit (National Chairman/NGWA), Leon de Beer (General Manager), Casper Labuschagne (National Vice Chairman NWGA), HB van der Walt (Eastern Cape), Herman Hugo (Northern Cape), Machiel Odendaal (Mpumalanga), Schalk Jacobs (Free State), Jan Louis Venter (Free State), Bom Louw (KZN), **SA Mohair Growers' Assoc.** - Coligny Stegmann, Petrie Maré, **Wildlife Ranching SA** - Adri Kitshoff-Botha, **RPO** - Lardus van Zyl (Large Stock Industry), Herman Archer (Free State), Koning Scholtz (Northern Cape), Sakkie van Zyl (North West), Hendrik Botha (KZN), **ALPRU/UFS** - HO De Waal, Per invitation by HO de Waal - Walter van Niekerk, **Researcher** - Niël Viljoen, **Environmental Affairs** - Wessel Jacobs (Northern Cape), Lourens Goosen (Free State), Tim de Jongh (Eastern Cape), **DAFF** - Mandla Lukhele, **Free State Hunters** - Daan Bodenstein, **Per invitation** - Dr. Dave Balfour (NMMU), Prof. Justin O'Riain (UCT) and **PMF Secretariat** - Bonita Francis. Apologies: Jaco van Deventer (Cape Nature), Dirk Krapohl (RPO Northern Cape), Frikkie Wentzel (RPO Eastern Cape), Gerhard Schutte (RPO), Thys de Wet (Scientist), Magdel Boshoff (DEA), Thomas Mbedzi (DEA), Dr. Gerhard Verdoorn (Independent Scientist) and Michau Muller (NWGA Northern Cape). Absent: Koos Davel (Mpumalanga RPO), Sam Makhubele (Limpopo Province – Environmental Affairs) and Graham Keet (KZN Environmental Affairs).*

1. OPENING AND WELCOME

Herman Hugo opened the meeting with prayer and the Chairman welcomed everyone present.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the previous meeting, which were held on 27 August 2015 at the University of Free State was approved on the proposal of Casper Labuschagne and seconded by HB van der Walt. Spelling error was pointed out.

4. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

4.1 Feedback on the status of the DCA Norms and Standards and TOPS (arising)

Magdel Boshoff report via Coligny Stegmann:
Minister signed the notice for the Gazette, we will be publishing for comment in the next week or 2. Way forward: (1) Consolidation and assessment of the comments; (2) Revising the norms and standards based on comments received; (3) Approval of the final document by Working Group 1, MINTECH and MINMEC (Ministers and MEC); (4) Socio-economic impact assessment (to identify the costs, benefits and risks of the N&S); (5) Parliamentary approval (National Council of Provinces and National Assembly); (6) Final approval by the Minister; and (7) Publication of the final notice in the Gazette for implementation.
Time frame until implementation: approximately 6 months

Decision: To remain in contact with DEA regarding the process.

4.2 Permission to apply predator control in nature reserves (arising)

Extract previous meeting

Provincial legislation prohibits the control of predation in nature reserves, which seems to be a breeding ground for jackal. Only after 10 months were the Free State Hunters Association allowed to hunt.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - 2021

Lourens Goosen said that the law prohibits it. Magdel Boshoff further indicated that DEA cannot force problems to provincial legislation.

Secretariat omitted to direct letter to the Free State Dept. Environmental Affairs regarding the concerns of Free State Hunting Assoc.

The problem seems much broader than the Free State, because Coligny Stegmann shared the sentiment of East Cape national parks whereby huge losses are experienced because of non-existence of electrified fencing.

PMF chairman had a discussion with Prof. Graham Kerley, NMMU where concerns were raised about jackal from national parks overflowing to farmland. He undertook to incorporate it under PredSA and mentioned that there could be fencing problems at reserves of SANPARKS.

The meeting took note of the comment that the problem escalates when the electric fencing is switched off, thereby making the maintenance of electric fencing the issue to be addressed.

Daan Bodenstein referred to statistics from Free State Hunters Association from last year indicating astronomical figures which indicate that jackal are coming from national parks. "If there is no control in parks, we are fighting a losing battle", he said.

Coligny Stegmann remarked that no hunting or measures to control the number of animals in national parks are allowed and that the request for better management and control be relayed to authorities.

Herman Hugo referred to the killing of 200 jackals in the national park in Beaufort West and that it be used as basis to do the same in the rest of the country.

Prof. Justin O'Riain, UCT remarked that the culling of jackal in national reserves is happening and that they are worried about the public backlash as they do not have scientific evidence. Ultimately the initial effort should be the upkeep and maintenance of fencing.

Wessel Jacobs reaffirmed the importance of the upkeep and maintenance of electric fencing and that the will and competence of officials responsible for the control inside national parks are non-existent.

Tim de Jong requested research on the height of electric fencing as many of these fences are currently lethal to turtles, which is creating a further problem. Lardus van Zyl referred to an alternative method which bypasses the problem.

Proposal: If provincial nature conservation authorities are not in a position to manage the problem, then an organised, structured and uniform method should be proposed to provincial/local authorities. Free State hunting association indicated that they will render their services free of charge. The principle needs to be established that wherever the location of farmland, that legislation is executive in uniform manner.

Letter from PMF on this issue to be addressed to the provincial biodiversity technical committee.

Schalk Jacobs, PMF Free State enquired about the state of "brandsiek jakkalse".

To approach someone to write article – name of Dr. van Heerden, Western Cape was mentioned.

Action: PMF Secretariat.

5. MATTERS FOR DISCUSSION

5.1 Predation management information centre (PMIC)

The chairman gave some background regarding the tender process and the 2 applicants namely NMMU and UFS. The process has been terminated and the steering committee decided to start negotiations with the institution who actually withdrew from the tender process. UFS is already running a similar type centre and in order to alleviate any duplication, the PMF provided the UFS with a list of functions to be carried out.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

1. Research country wide will be conducted in normal manner, with outcomes and results being captured at PMIC.

2. Possible hotspots for predator control could be identified through the Centre and addressed by specialists.

3. PMIC will not be manned on a 24/7 basis, but electronic queries will be dealt with immediately the following morning.

4. Awaiting budget from UFS, where industries will contribute proportionately according to a formula per losses.

5. UFS can only sign an agreement with a legal entity, which the PMF is not. For the interim, agreements will be signed with individual industries.

Discussion: (1) Sakkie van Zyl enquired about the intellectual property of the research data – UFS or PMF? HO de Waal replied that one of the functions of the PMIC will be to gather information from farmers. Research will be a secondary function and usually it belongs to the institution (UFS). Each case will be dealt with on merit and finalised with an agreement; and (2) Prof. Justin O'Riain, UCT referred to a similar system in the Peninsula – call centre capturing data on baboons. He warned that the activists have taken the information with the intention to use it against the university. HO de Waal replied that the raw data will be dealt with on a strict and confidential basis and anyone wanting to access the data will be dealt with on a case-to-case basis.

5.2 M44 device (arising)

Gerhard Verdoorn not present to provide feedback. Lourens Goosen was unable to give an update. The SA version has been manufactured, awaiting the finalisation of Norms and Standards.

Lardus van Zyl expressed concern over the lack of progress with the device, resulting in farmers using illegal control methods to kill packs of hunting dogs, which has become an illegal method of control.

Niel Viljoen said that this problem should not be underestimated and farmers in the WC and NC have resolved to using methods not conducive to the environment.

Coligny Stegmann remarked that the specification of the mechanism of the device needs to be described in the TOPS regulations and that the poison to be used with the device is actually the problem. To await the finalisation of Norms and Standards. Cannot import the device and use it illegally, he said.

Decision: Get more information from Dr. Gerhard Verdoorn and circulate as necessary.

5.3 Protocol for helicopter hunting

Coligny Stegmann explained the reason why the issue has resurfaced. Had a discussion with Niël Viljoen and the following additions to be considered: (a) Sept – December should be excluded for helicopter hunting as jackal have young ones and they are then more challenging to catch; (b) Landowner/farmer should always be in charge of the operation; and (c) The word "hunting" may not be used, as hunting from a helicopter is illegal.

Protocol to be circulated to Coligny Stegmann, Niël Viljoen, Adri Kitshoff-Botha and Lardus van Zyl, where after it will be approved.

5.4 Report back from provincial PMF

5.5 Report back from provincial environmental departments

Each province had an opportunity to report on predation related issues.

The importance of functional provincial PMF's was accentuated in order to address issues such as training courses, non-accreditation of hunters etc. Jan Louis Venter to investigate the possibility of incorporating North West into Free State PMF.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

5.5.1 Leopard problem in Baviaans

Coligny Stegmann elaborated on an incident in the Baviaans area where a worker was attacked by a leopard; farmer tried to obtain permit, but EC department did not want to issue the document.

Tim de Jongh referred to departmental initiatives in the Eastern Cape – leopard workshop, implementation of post workshop actions, terms of reference with a strategy in place for damage causing leopards. However provincial budgets are exhausted and the department does not have the capacity to address problem in the EC. Lardus van Zyl also made mention of leopard problems in the northern parts of SA – if animal has a commercial value, it will be protected.

Adri Kitshoff Botha undertook to give regular feedback on the leopard issue as WRSA and PHASA are very much involved in the hunting of leopard. The more restrictions on trophy hunting, the more leopards are being killed.

Tim de Jongh undertook to further brush up on the leopard issue and will circulate the necessary documentation to the PMF secretariat. There seems to be a lot of confusion over the leopard issue because no one has relevant information.

Decision: (1) As PMF, support can be given to provincial representatives; and (2) WRSA to provide feedback.

5.6 Adoption and underwriting of accredited courses

Report via Magdel Boshoff: "Provinces have agreed to accept Niel's training course as the minimum for future training by training providers. However, the training manuals must still be approved by provinces, as they do not know what the content of the course is. Provinces to indicate when such a meeting could be convened. Niël to further indicate how/when his training manual can be made available to provinces."

Decision: The process is on track. To communicate with Magdel Boshoff regarding date for meeting.

5.7 Predation prevention manual

The manual was handed out to members. Leon de Beer briefly informed the meeting of the distribution process of the booklet. Mandla Lukhele has undertaken to approach DAFF for funding to translate the booklet into Xhosa, especially for the EC livestock farmers. Majority of publications will be given to Niel Viljoen to give to his training attendees.

Coligny Stegmann requested the assistance of Mandla Lukhele in making appointment with Minister/newly appointed DG.

5.8 Cheaper fencing

In addition to cheaper fencing, the Humansdorp Co-op handed over a cheque in the amount of R45 000 to be used for predator training. Leon de Beer reported that they are interested in running a similar initiative some time in future. He further elaborated on the quality of fencing, which is being manufactured by a JHB based company and that products are registered with the SABS for quality assurance.

Koning Scholtz referred to the possibility of investigating another material such as nylon and the lifespan thereof. Different material could be a cheaper alternative.

Casper Labuschagne congratulated the PMF on an excellent initiative.

Decision: (1) Specifications of wire netting: (a) 75mm instead of 90mm jackal proof fencing is more suitable in most areas; (b) Double galvanised; and (2) Consider the possibility of other material such as nylon.

6. RESEARCH PROJECTS

Version 5.0 - PD de Waal - Version 5.0

6.1 Predation research

Leon de Beer on behalf of Gerhard Schutte briefly reported on predation research projects resorting under the RMRD.

6.2 PredSA (Scientific Assessment)

Prof. Dave Balfour, NMMU used the forum to provide feedback and receive engagement from stakeholders regarding PredSA, which is not a scientific, but social process designed to bring the findings of science by relevant experts to bear on the needs of decision makers. He invited everyone to air their views and comments on the PredSA website. NMMU will formally respond to each question on the website.

On a question by Prof. HO de Waal, he confirmed that the wildlife sector is included and even covers the communal sphere. "There is no exclusion at all", Prof. Balfour said.

The meeting took cognisance that Leon de Beer and Coligny Stegmann are serving on the Process Custodian Group on behalf of PMF.

6.3 Predation training programme

Report back and presentation by Niel Viljoen on predation training programme on 30 monitor (demonstration) farms in South Africa.

6.3.1 Monitor farms: Scientific article(s)

Leon de Beer reported that Liaan Minnie have made himself available to assist Niël Viljoen to include information and statistics collected from monitor farms in a scientific publication, should the data be suitable for this purpose. Leon de Beer to provide NMMU with this information.

6.4 Research Western Cape

Prof. Justin O'Riain, University of Cape Town informed the forum of different research projects in the Western Cape that the University is involved with including testing the effectiveness of livestock guarding dogs and echo herders on commercial farmland in Namaqualand as well as negotiations with SKA. Baboons are taking on a disaster of epic proportions and he is urging farmers who are exposed to baboons killing livestock, to contact him.

7. COMMUNICATION

To a large extent, this will be part of the PMIC.

8. GOALS FOR THE NEXT 12 MONTHS

<u>Immediately</u>: (1) Get PMIC implemented, (a) Identifying focus areas, (b) Support to farmers in threatened areas, (c) Update website and link to PMIC, and (d) Finalisation of Norms and standards; (2) Sort out funding of PMIC; (3) Finalise appointments with DAFF and DEA; (4) Everyone to take up the responsibility to market PMF – use the tool box, and (5) Accreditation of night hunters (Coligny Stegmann)."

At the PMF meeting (24 August 2016), Mr. Niël Viljoen presented information on the predation training programme he was conducting for the NWGA. In a PowerPoint presentation, some information obtained at 30 demonstration/monitor farms in South Africa was summarised. Among others, a map identified the broad locations of 30 demonstration/monitor farms in South Africa. The 30 farms (total area 156 188 ha) comprised (respective districts in brackets and total areas) four farms in the Western Cape (28 600 ha; Struisbaai, Laingsburg, Gouritsmond, Beaufort West), six farms in the Northern Cape (55 460 ha; Sutherland, Fraserburg, Loxton, Victoria West, Britstown, Noupoort), seven farms in the Eastern Cape (34 040 ha; Jansenville,

Version 5.0 - Hoole Waal - Version 5.0

Aberdeen, Hofmeyer, Jamestown, Bedford, Maclear, Dordrecht), six farms in the Free State (14 355 ha; Philippolis, Wepener, Trompsburg, Brandfort, Senekal, Vrede), three farms in KwaZulu-Natal (16 600 ha; Underberg, Utrecht, Luneburg) and four farms in Mpumalanga (7 063 ha; Wakkerstroom, Amersfoort, Ermelo, Carolina). Furthermore, a graph summarised the total livestock (sheep) losses and the number of predators killed (in brackets) for all demonstration/monitor farms in eight consecutive years: 2 302 (214) – 2008; 2 352 (227) – 2009; 2 131 (284) – 2010; 1 443 (379) – 2011; 1 313 (452) - 2012; 1 214 (425) - 2013; 1 095 (454) - 2014; and 1 030 (359) - 2015.

Detailed information remained scant regarding the content of the training courses and was apparently privy only to the trainees. Similarly, little was divulged about the actual sites of the demonstration/monitor farms and only summaries were provided on results.

Mr. Leon de Beer reported that Dr. Liaan Minnie of the NMMU availed himself to assist Mr. Niël Viljoen to include the information and statistics collected from demonstration/monitor farms in a scientific publication[975], should the data be suitable for this purpose. Mr. Leon de Beer would provide the information to Dr. Liaan Minnie at the NMMU.

At the PMF meeting of 24 August 2016 in Bloemfontein, Prof. HO de Waal emphasised that the PMF must acquire legal status to allow it to close contractual arrangements with service providers such as for example the University of the Free State. Having to rely on intermediaries such as the NWGA to act on its behalf can only be a temporary arrangement. The arrangements to establish the envisaged predation management centre will require at least four separate Memoranda of Agreements, one with each of the four producers' organisations comprising the PMF. It will entail unnecessary administrative burdens.

The Scientific Assessment[976] was launched by the Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University (NMMU). The following short background was provided on 26 August 2016 for this initiative that also became known as *PredSA*:

> *"**1. Background***
>
> *The Co-operative Research Programme: Stock Predation Research (CRP:SPR) housed within the Centre for African Conservation Ecology (ACE) at Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University (NMMU) was formulated with the following overall goal:*
>
> > *To conduct appropriate and strategically determined research, that takes into account the problems and needs of the small-stock industry, and environmental (ecological) requirements, and also the outcomes of acceptable research conducted to date, with a view to providing sound, scientifically-based directions (guidelines) to (a) the industry, and to (b) the policymakers, with the overall aim of appropriately mitigating the problems caused by predation on stock, especially by jackal and caracal.*
>
> *Prior to embarking on a new series of research initiatives, as part of the proposed programme, a comprehensive understanding of the nature and scope of the issue at hand needed to be developed as well as a 'stock-taking' to determine what we do and do not know about it. In addition, as the issue of stock predation has strong commercial, conservation, policy and other interests, it was also vital that the process received good 'buy-in' from key stakeholders, notably the small-stock industry, government, and researchers. The most effective way of achieving these objectives is to conduct a formal*

[975] Editor's Note: On at least three occasions, ALPRU offered to assist Mr. Niël Viljoen in analyzing and publishing the data. It was also suggested that he should consider using the information to register for further studies at an appropriate tertiary institution.

[976] *For more information on the PredSA visit http://predsa.mandela.ac.za.*

Version 5.0 HO de Waal - Version 5.0

Scientific Assessment, which is a process that translates existing scientific information into a form usable by policymakers. Thus a proposal was developed to fund and conduct a Scientific Assessment of the nature and extent of the problem and the existing knowledge around the issue of predation on small livestock by jackal and caracal.

NMMU, through ACE, has thus partnered with the Department of Environmental Affairs, the Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries through the Red Meat Research Development Planning Committee, the National Wool Growers Association, Cape Wools and the Mohair Trust and initiated the process of undertaking a Scientific Assessment (SA) on the issue of predation on small livestock in South Africa (hereafter PredSA). The SA will be formally launched in June 2016 by an announcement by either the Minister of Environmental Affairs or, if she is unavailable, the Project Leader. Approximately R2.5 Million has been committed to the Assessment and it will be 18 to 24 months in duration, starting May 2016.

The SA will be conducted as an independent, science-based assessment, along the lines of the Elephant Management Assessment[1]. The 'philosophy' of the SA is based on global best practice in SA theory and implementation. The 'scientific assessment process' will be grounded in transparency and participatory processes; in order to satisfy the principles of ***legitimacy****,* ***saliency*** *and* ***credibility****.*

The objective of the SA is to inform decision maker's (in this case the South African government departments, and specifically the Ministers of Environmental Affairs and of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries) understanding of the issues around predation of small livestock, based on the evaluation by acknowledged experts of the best available information. It will translate available scientific and "grey literature" as well as personal knowledge from South Africa into a form usable by policymakers. It will be characterized by an extensive, transparent (i.e. in the public domain once the reviews have been received and the responses made) review process by both experts and stakeholders.

The SA will consider both the commercial and environmental issues as well as ethical, social and legal considerations. The key outputs from the SA will be a scientifically reviewed document detailing the current state of our knowledge as well as guidelines for policy makers which will seek to inform in a summary format and to be policy neutral. It is key to understand that the outputs will not be policy prescriptive."

It was indicated that the preliminary chapter list of the Scientific Assessment (PredSA) would include the following:

"(1) Introduction and context; (2) History of predator-stock conflict in South Africa; (3) Impacts of predators on the stock industry in South Africa; (4) Review of past and current predator management practices; (5) Jackal and caracal ecology and biology and their interactions with livestock; (6) Biology/ecology of other predators and their interactions with livestock; (7) Ethical considerations in the management of livestock predator impacts; (8) Legal considerations in the management of livestock predator impacts; (9) Review of international management practices of livestock predation: Lessons for South Africa; (10) Role of meso-predators in functioning ecosystems and potential impacts of their management; (11) Review of management options and research needs; and (12.) Summary for policy makers."

Initially the protocol indicated that the Scientific Assessment was aimed at the small-stock industry in South Africa, but this narrow view was later revised and broadened to include all livestock, as well as the wildlife and communal sectors. This was seemingly a direct result of the interaction by Prof. Dave Balfour (NMMU) with some members at the PMF meeting of 24 August 2016 at the UFS in Bloemfontein.

Version 5.0 - Hoofdwad - Version 5.0

On behalf of ALPRU co-workers, Prof. HO de Waal presented three scientific papers[977],[978],[979] on predation management at the 9th International Wildlife Ranching Symposium from 12-16 September 2016 at the Safari Court Hotel, Windhoek, Namibia.

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMF Newsletter SEPTEMBER 2016[980]:

- **Are you using herd protecting animals?**
- Jolandie Botha, Masters Student of the Faculty of Veterinary Science at the University of Pretoria asked farmers to cooperate and submit a short questionnaire to determine the factors leading to success or failure in controlling livestock losses. Farmers with two or more years' experience in using donkeys, alpacas or herd protecting dogs to protect the livestock from black-backed jackals and caracal was requested to participate. Please contact Jolandie (telephone) or Jolandie.botha@imalivest.co.za

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter SEPTEMBER 2016[981]:

"Early 2017 should see the implementation of norms and standards

The representative of the Department of Environmental Affairs' (DEA) on the Predation Management Forum (PMF), Magdel Boshoff, reported on the status of the draft Norms and standards for the management of damage-causing animals in South Africa (DCA Norms and Standards) and the way forward. The Minister of Environmental Affairs has approved the publication of the draft norms and standards in the Government Gazette for public participation for a period of 30 days. During that period any person may submit comments or written representations to the DEA. At the conclusion of the public participation period, all the comments will be consolidated and assessed. The provisions of the draft norms and standards will also be amended, depending on the nature of the comments received. The revised draft norms and standards will then be submitted for final approval, which will include approval by the various intergovernmental committees and Parliament. The approval process further includes a socio-economic impact assessment to identify the costs, benefits and risks of the norms and standards. Once the approval process has been concluded, the final norms and standards will be published in the Government Gazette for implementation. The expected time frame until implementation will be approximately six months with presentations to the DEA."

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter SEPTEMBER 2016[982]:

*"**Register to get updates on predator scientific assessment (PredSA)***

The Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University has created a website detailing the process that will be followed for the Scientific Assessment on Livestock Predation in South Africa.

There is a Stakeholder Registration page on the website where interested parties can register their interest in the project so as to get updates on the assessment.

The link to the PredSA Website is http://predsa.nmmu.ac.za.

Version 5.0 - Hoole Wahl - Version 5.0

[977] Badenhorst, Conrad, Van Niekerk, Walter, Strydom, Dirkie, Jordaan, Henry & De Waal, HO, 2016. The impact of predation losses on beef cattle in South Africa. 9th International Wildlife Ranching Symposium, 12-16 September 2016. Safari Court Hotel, Windhoek, Namibia.

[978] De Waal, HO & Combrinck, Willie, 2016. Demography and morphometry of an important mesopredator (black-backed jackal – *Canis mesomelas*) in southern Africa. 9th International Wildlife Ranching Symposium, 12-16 September 2016. Safari Court Hotel, Windhoek, Namibia.

[979] Schepers, Anche, Van Niekerk, Walter, Matthews, Nicolette & De Waal, HO, 2016. The impact of predation losses on wildlife ranches in Limpopo Province, South Africa. 9th International Wildlife Ranching Symposium, 12-16 September 2016. Safari Court Hotel, Windhoek, Namibia.

[980] PMF Newsletter SEPTEMBER 2016; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

[981] PMF Newsletter SEPTEMBER 2016; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

[982] PMF Newsletter SEPTEMBER 2016; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Specific commenting periods will be set aside for reviewing PredSA documents as they are drafted, but general comments can be emailed to PredSA@nmmu.ac.za at any stage of the assessment."

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMF Newsletter SEPTEMBER 2016[983]:

- **Set strands in this way to prevent electrocution of tortoises**
- Electric fences that are not set correct may cause by electrocution the death of tortoises, leguaan and pangolins[984].
- The PMF's Best Practices for Predation Management in SA toon clearly shows that the earthing strand must be the first and lowest strand closest to the ground – definitely not the first conductor of electricity. That electrical conductor (strand) must be set higher.
- Fix the earthing strand about 10 cm above the ground to prevent tortoises, leguaan, etc. from touching an electric strand.
- Fix the first electric conducting stand slightly higher (20 cm).
- Fix the top electric strand about 15 cm above the ordinary fence.
- Fences must be equipped with alarms to signal when animals are entangled in the fence. Such animals must be released immediately and injuries preferably treated by a veterinarian before they are released.
- The current on fences must be set that it does not lethally electrocute animals.

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter SEPTEMBER 2016[985]:

*"**Are baboons killing your livestock?***

Prof. Justin O'Riain, of the University of Cape Town, addressed the PMF at their annual meeting in August 2016 on research projects being conducted in the Western Cape.

The meeting was informed that the threat posed by baboons is becoming a disaster of epic proportions. He urged farmers who are exposed to baboons that are killing livestock, to contact him on 021 650 3645 / 083 419 4228 or to email him at Justin.ORiain@uct.ac.za'

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter SEPTEMBER 2016[986]:

*"**Predator research in the central Karoo***

A research document entitled 'The effects of jackal and caracal on the sustainability of sheep farming in the central Karoo: Ecology meets management solutions', has been published as the outcome of one of the predation-related research projects currently being conducted under the auspices of Red Meat Research and Development of South Africa (RMRD SA), the official research advisory structure of the PMF. The research was conducted under the guidance of UCT researcher Prof. Beatrice Conradie.

The project has been collecting management data since 2012 and the final wave of data collection will commence shortly.

The data will allow researchers to investigate the performance of sheep production systems and look into the effectiveness of predator control on farms. There is still a year left on the PhD (jackal and caracal ecology) and post-doctoral projects (the baboon conflict), after which the researchers would be in a position to integrate their findings."

Version 5.0 – HO de Waal – Version 5.0

[983] PMF Newsletter SEPTEMBER 2016; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[984] *Manis temminckii* ('letermagog')
[985] PMF Newsletter SEPTEMBER 2016; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[986] PMF Newsletter SEPTEMBER 2016; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

On 10 October 2016, Prof. HO de Waal gave a presentation[987] on the impact of predation and predation management to students registered for a diploma course in agriculture by BathoPele at The Towers, Langenhovenpark, Bloemfontein.

On 18 October 2016, Prof. HO de Waal gave a presentation[988] on the impact of predation and the need for coordinated predation management in South Africa at Operation Phakisa: Agriculture, Land Reform and Rural Development, OR Tambo Conference Centre, Boksburg, Gauteng Province.

With the input and assistance of Dr. Gert Dry (WRSA), an executive summary was submitted to the organisers of Operation Phakisa on 24 October 2016:

"***Coordinated Predation Management Service***

National approach

Predation on livestock farms and wildlife ranches falls within the general ambit of agriculture, in close participation with relevant environmental/conservation authorities

Situation statement

Currently (2016) the estimated direct losses ascribed to predation exceed ZAR 2 500 000 000
This huge negative impact does not include other indirect costs, namely (among others):

- *Marked losses in employment/jobs on farms/towns/cities*
- *Increased social burden on state (social grants, etc.) - people migrate to peri-urban settings*
- *Increased losses in state revenues (income tax and VAT) - result of lower production levels*
- *Increased negative impact on food security*
- *Negative impact on biodiversity and conservation*

Solution/approach

- *Reduce losses/mitigate impact to less than ZAR 1 800 000 000 by 2020*
- *Reduce losses/mitigate impact to less than ZAR 900 000 000 by 2030*
- *Safeguard food security for the nation*
- *Reduce employment/jobs losses on farms/towns/cities*
- *Reduce losses in state revenues (income tax and VAT)*
- *Mitigate the negative impact of predation on biodiversity and conservation*

How

Create a national division/directorate (@ annual cost to company), namely:

By	***2020***	***2030***
Managers (@ZAR 500 000)	*5*	*10*
	[ZAR 2 500 000]	*[ZAR 5 000 000]*
Supervisors (@ZAR 300 000)	*45*	*90*
	[ZAR 13 500 000]	*[ZAR 27 000 000]*
Trappers/specialists (@ZAR 250 000)	*100*	*400*
	[ZAR 25 000 000]	*[ZAR 100 000 000]*
Administrative components (@ZAR 130 000)	*50*	*150*
	[ZAR 6 500 000]	*[ZAR 19 500 000]*
Totals	***[ZAR 47 500 000]***	***[ZAR 151 500 000]***

Responsibilities/functions/roles

In addition to the specialist services provided to stakeholders/role players and managing predation on a coordinated national basis, this division/directorate will be responsible to:

- *Create/maintain an **institutional memory**/GIS/toolkits/library (hard copies & electronic)*
- *Disseminate relevant and appropriate information at various levels/audiences*
- *Provide appropriate equipment/methodologies to manage predation (non-lethal & lethal)*
- *Coordination (international/national/provincial/district)*
- *Liaise (international/national/provincial/district)*

[987] De Waal, HO, 2016. Die impak van predasie en roofdierbestuur. RPO – Diplomakursus in Veeproduksie. Batho Pele – Venue, The Towers, Langenhovenpark. 10 Oktober 2016. Bloemfontein.
[988] De Waal, HO, 2016. The impact of predation and predation management. Operation Phakisa: Agriculture, Land Reform and Rural Development. 18 October 2016. OR Tambo Conference Centre, Boksburg, Gauteng, South Africa.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

- *Monitoring*
- *Training at various levels*
- *Extension*
- *Research & development*
- *Liaison (with various stakeholders & role players)*
- *Public relations*
- *Funding (sourcing)"*

The following text was also provided to the organisers of Operation Phakisa:

"*The impact of predation and a system of coordinated predation management in South Africa*[989]

Ruminant livestock utilises veld (natural pasture or rangeland) as a major feed source and in South Africa veld comprises about 80% of the land available for agriculture (De Waal, 1990). Veld is grazed by ruminants, namely domesticated cattle, sheep and goats as well as indigenous wildlife; it is also utilised by other herbivores species such as domesticated equines and several wildlife species. Therefore, domesticated and wild herbivorous species play an important role in providing food security for the nation.

Of equal importance is the large and medium-sized carnivorous predators that have been part of the South Africa landscape for centuries and predation losses are not uncommon. However, predation losses on livestock farms and wildlife ranches are poorly quantified. Recently predation losses on sheep and goats in five provinces were estimated to be more than ZAR 1.39 thousand million annually (Van Niekerk, 2010). In a second study (Badenhorst, 2014) predation losses for beef cattle in seven provinces were estimated at more than ZAR 383 million annually. In a third study (Schepers, 2016) quantified the negative impact of predation on wildlife ranches in South Africa, which is comparable to those for livestock. Generally, predation losses have been ascribed to black-backed jackal Canis mesomelas, caracal Caracal caracal, leopard Panthera pardus, brown hyaena Hyaena brunnea, cheetah Acinonyx jubatus and vagrant dogs Canis familiaris. Back-backed jackal was mostly the predominant predator, but in Limpopo and North West provinces, leopard was implicated for most predation losses.

South Africa is richly endowed with indigenous wildlife, but the population size of larger mammal species has varied greatly over the past century. The incentive provided by the Game Theft Act, Act 105 of 1991 as amended, allowed individuals to engage in natural resource based private enterprises which gave rise to rapid development of the South African wildlife industry; focussing mainly, if not exclusively, on herbivorous species. In many parts of South Africa traditional livestock, but also other agricultural activities have been replaced by wildlife ranching. However, because these activities rely on the same natural resource base, changing from domesticated ruminant livestock to ruminant antelopes provides no escape from the negative impact of carnivorous predators. Hence, losses due to predation impact negatively on both the livestock and wildlife ranching industries.

Solutions to manage the challenges regarding human-wildlife conflict in South Africa call for a common South African institutional memory. Important information is currently kept in different official databases by the nine provincial and national departments; apparently these sources are filed without being integrated and often also in total isolation from each other. On the other hand, the overwhelming majority of information on predation and hunting of predators is privately held by a large number of specialist predator hunters and farmers. Again, there is no real integration with other private and public sources of information.

Although the founding of the PMF (Predation Management Forum) in 2009 was a momentous step in the proverbial right direction, the PMF remains only a forum to unite the

[989] **HO de Waal.** Department of Animal, Wildlife and Grassland Sciences & African Large Predator Research Unit (ALPRU), PO Box 339, University of the Free State, Bloemfontein, South Africa. dewaalho@ufs.ac.za

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

different livestock and wildlife producers' organisations for a common purpose and action, namely predation management. It is very important that PMF urgently engage with other role players in a system of coordinated predation management (CPM). These other role players include among others the national and provincial departments of environmental affairs and agriculture, universities which can make a scientific contribution, scientific research institutions and meaningful representation by specialist predator hunters.

In an ideal system of CPM, the farmers and government are equal partners, each with specific responsibilities. The government is responsible for policy, coordination, extension, training, research, monitoring and effective communication, while the livestock farmers and wildlife ranchers are responsible to protect their animal and control predators. An important element of the system is an institutional memory or management information system (MIS). It is the pivot for common information, planning, leadership and guidance with predation management and also to prevent the fragmented and uncoordinated actions. This system of CPM should form part of the official structures of the departments of agriculture (national and provincial), with good liaison and coordination with their national and provincial counterparts in environmental affairs.

Ostensibly, the government currently does not have the political or financial capacity, expertise or vision to handle the situation. South Africa can no longer afford to tread water. Therefore, until the government is able and competent to accept the responsibility and functions, the affected parties through the producers' organisations (e.g. linked through the PMF) should contribute financially to the initiation and running of a small functional unit which can progressively build greater capacity and eventually handle and run the full system.

Relevant information regarding predation and predation management methods must be collated and analysed continuously and made available in the MIS to guide the specialists in predation management more effectively. The MIS is a national asset and the information must be readily available for all users.

Good information regarding predation and control methods which are used, are important components of a system of CPM. The institutional memory serves as central information source and should quickly provide practical answers on the following type of questions:

- *In which areas is predation losses reported (species involved)?*
- *Is there a relation between reported cases of predation and the predation management?*
- *Is there a decline in reported cases of predation following predation management?*
- *What are the results achieved with different predation management methods?*
- *Which relevant questions must be resolved through directed scientific research?*
- *Who are the recognised and proven role players (e.g. specialists in managing predators)?*

The MIS should accommodate and maintain in real time a range of information sets (electronic/hard copy), integrated in an orderly system, for example:

- *Full detail (linked to GIS) of reported cases of predation (type of animal, where, etc.).*
- *Full detail (linked to GIS) of reported cases of predation control (method used, species, sex, date, time, etc.).*
- *Full contact detail of government departments and functional offices/staff who are involved with the initiative.*
- *Full contact detail of the PMF's, as well as the livestock and wildlife producers' organisations, functional offices/staff who are involved with the initiative.*
- *Full contact detail of the other role players' (universities and scientific research institutions) offices/specialised staff who are involved with the initiative.*
- *Full contact detail and other relevant information regarding the fields of expertise of the specialist predator hunters.*
- *Full detail regarding relevant acts, regulations and policies applicable to the different aspects of the initiative.*

Version 5.0 – HO de Waal (Version 5.0)

- *Full contact detail regarding the government departments' offices/staff responsible for enforcement of regulations and issuing of permits.*
- *A functional collection of publications (hard copy and/or electronic) on predators, predation and relevant associated topics.*
- *A functional collection of available management methods (non-lethal and lethal) devices or equipment (foothold traps, cage traps, collars, bells, getters, etc.) as well as the appropriate specifications and correct way to obtain, safeguard, store and handle the device or equipment.*

The MIS must be kept updated in time by the system of CPM; it is meant to lay the information basis for a continuous assessment of biological, physical, economic and social factors to make meaningful adjustments of the different elements of coordinated predation management. The MIS also serves as information source to identify and prioritise research needs requiring urgent scientific answers. Relevant information from the MIS is urgently and directly communicated with all relevant role players for further action and application.

Acknowledging the widespread impact of predation should be sufficient justification to obtain the much needed funds (seed money) for the first modest system of CPM from the affected parties, namely the livestock farmers and wildlife ranchers. The current PMF can be used as common link with the farmers. With the funds obtained in this way, a basic facility/office can be established to serve as spearhead from which the envisaged full system of CPM may be developed in time. In the meantime, the positive lobbying of politicians and officials must be continued with a view to migrate and place the system of CPM eventually in the government sphere – the appropriate site where the system of CPM actually belongs.

So what does it mean? The extent to which the system of CPM will support farmers to reduce the impact of predation it will have commensurate beneficial effects on the economy. A reduction in the cost of predation, both indirect (prevention of predation – cost of non-lethal and lethal methods) and direct costs (losses of cattle, sheep, goats and wildlife/game) will lead to more profitable production. This will also have a direct positive effect by reducing job losses in rural South Africa and actually lead to higher employment. It will also have commensurate positive effects on food security and conservation of biodiversity.

Clearly, the current approach in South Africa to manage predation is fragmented and uncoordinated. It cannot be allowed to persist (Bergman et al., 2013). The alarming scale and impact of predation on livestock farms and wildlife ranches calls for a focused and coordinated predation management and research programme to reduce (mitigate) the negative impact of predation and specifically to manage and human-wildlife conflict (Bergman et al., 2013; Du Plessis, 2013; Du Plessis et al., 2015). Urgent revision of the enabling legislation pertaining to different tiers of government and specifically impeding regulations are required.

References

Badenhorst, C.G., 2014. The cost of large stock predation in the North West Province. M.Sc. Agric. dissertation. University of the Free State, Bloemfontein, South Africa.

Bergman, D.L., De Waal, H.O., Avenant, N.L., Bodenchuk, M.J., Marlow, M.C. & Dale, D.L., 2013. The need to address black-backed jackal and caracal predation in South Africa. Proceedings 15th Wildlife Damage Management Conference, 25-28 March 2013, Clemson, South Carolina (J.B. Armstrong, G.R. Gallagher, Eds.).

De Waal, H.O., 1990. Animal production from native pasture (veld) in the Free State Region - a perspective of the grazing ruminant. South African Journal of Animal Science 20, 1-9.

Du Plessis, J., 2013. Towards the development of a sustainable management strategy for Canis mesomelas and Caracal caracal on rangeland. Ph.D. thesis. University of the Free State, Bloemfontein, South Africa.

Version 5.0 - HO AE Wood - Version 5.0

Du Plessis, J.J., Avenant, N.L. & De Waal, H.O., 2015. Quality and quantity of the scientific information available on black-backed jackals and caracals: contributing to human-predator conflict management? African Journal of Wildlife Research 45(2): 138-157.

Gunter, Quinette, 2008. A critical evaluation of historical data on two damage causing predators, Canis mesomelas and Caracal caracal. M.Sc. dissertation. University of the Free State, Bloemfontein, South Africa.

Schepers, Anche, 2016. The economic impact of predation in the wildlife ranching industry in Limpopo, South Africa. M.Sc. Agric. dissertation. University of the Free State, Bloemfontein, South Africa.

Strauss, A.J., 2009. The impact of predation on a sheep enterprise in the Free State Province. M.Sc. Agric. dissertation. University of the Free State, Bloemfontein, South Africa.

Van Niekerk, H.N., 2010. The cost of predation on small-livestock in South Africa by medium-sized predators. M.Sc. Agric. dissertation. University of the Free State, Bloemfontein, South Africa."

Unofficial feedback suggested that the outcome of Operation Phakisa, including the input on predation management, was well received at the official report back ceremony on 28 October 2016.

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMF Newsletter OCTOBER 2016[990]:

- **Protocol for air control with helicopters**
- The control of predators from the air is described in the Best Practices for Predation Management as a remedial measure. The protocol for shooting from helicopters was accepted by the PMF as shown on the PMF website - www.pmfsa.co.za/images/news/Helikopterjag.pdf

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter OCTOBER 2016[991]:

> *"**Structured predation management programme should be in place for February jackal breeding***
>
> *The presence of predators on the farm should be monitored continuously. It is essential to have an excellent knowledge of the farm, as well as the areas where predators are generally found. This continuous monitoring usually focuses on the life cycles of the various predators. For example, in the case of the black-backed jackal, it is very important to detect their breeding holes and manage them professionally, especially in August. Another important time of the year is February, when young jackal from outside the farm's borders are looking for new homes. During these periods in particular, the farmer should schedule his time well in order to control and manage predators; in other words, a structured predation management programme should be in place.*
>
> *Read more about Integrated Predation Management in the recently launched Predation Management manual, the farmer's one-stop guide to identifying and managing predators, which appears on the PMF website. Click here for more info: www.pmfsa.co.za/images/news/Manual_Engels.pdf"*

The studies by Van Niekerk (2010) for sheep and goats, and Badenhorst (2014) on cattle showed the huge negative impact of predation in South Africa. With a view to broaden the understanding of predation, Schepers (2016) studied the impact of predation on the wildlife ranches. An allocation for funding (R150 000) of the study was approved by the RMRD SA[992]. It took some time before the funds were released via the NWGA; therefore, ALPRU acted in good faith and advanced the funds for the preparatory work for the study to commence during

[990] PMF Newsletter OCTOBER 2016; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[991] PMF Newsletter OCTOBER 2016; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[992] Minutes of the PMF meeting which was held on 28 August 2013 at the UFS in Bloemfontein.

Version 5.0 - H.O. de Waal - Version 5.0

2014. Excerpts from the abstract of the study by Schepers (2016)[993] are quoted below:

"South Africa has always been rich in wildlife species, but the population size has varied greatly over the past century. The incentive provided by the Game Theft Act, Act 105 of 1991 as amended, allowed individuals to engage in natural resource based private enterprises and gave rise to the rapid development of the wildlife industry. Losses due to predation are a large problem, not only in the small and large livestock industries, but losses have also been incurred in the wildlife ranching industry. There is not much known regarding wildlife numbers in South Africa, due to the difficulty in counting wildlife. Even though there are uncertainties regarding wildlife numbers, the number of animals sold on game auctions increased by 16.7% per year since 2009. The wildlife industry grew rapidly the past decade and is currently the sixth largest agricultural commodity in South Africa; every year more agricultural land previously devoted to livestock or crops are devoted to wildlife ranching.

This detailed study was conducted in all the provinces of South Africa. The dissertation focussed on the situation in the Limpopo province; basic information regarding the other Provinces of South Africa is included in ***Appendices****.*

The primary objective of the dissertation was to determine the economic implication of predation on the wildlife ranching industry of the Limpopo province, South Africa. This was not an easy task because of the large variety of wildlife species and because it is difficult to count wildlife.

The wildlife species (antelope) were divided into three groups based on the reported predation incurred on wildlife ranches, namely: large antelope species, small antelope species and scarce species/colour variant antelope. The direct cost is associated with the number of animals lost due to predation, this ZAR value was calculated per hectare for each of the species defined in the three groups. The indirect cost is the total cost associated with the prevention and control of predation. The total indirect cost was calculated as ZAR 26.15/ha.

The results obtained by calculating losses for the defined three scenarios provided an indication of how large the predation losses are on wildlife ranches. Calculating the total cost for the entire wildlife sector may lead to over or underestimations; therefore the total cost were calculated/ha.

Any wildlife rancher can use the baseline information and calculate his/her own financial losses; for example: a wildlife rancher who keeps nyalas on 5 000 ha can calculate his/her estimated total cost to be ZAR 593 765/year. A wildlife rancher who keeps blesbok on 12 000 ha can incur a total cost of ZAR 668 103/year and a wildlife rancher who keeps black impala and Livingston eland on 6 000 ha can calculate his/her total cost to be ZAR 11 957 637/year. It was concluded from these three scenarios that the losses due to predation, as calculated in all three groups, were large; this is in line with the hypothesis."

Schepers (2016) then concluded:

"This dissertation provides information for wildlife ranchers to calculate the total cost due to predation on their own specific wildlife ranches. They can improve their management practices and choose appropriate control methods, whether non-lethal, methods assisting wildlife ranchers or lethal methods. They can also view and adopt the more appropriate method to count their wildlife species."

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMF Newsletter OCTOBER 2016[994]:

- **Protocol for air control with helicopters**

[993] Schepers, Anche, 2016. The economic implications of predation on the Wildlife Ranching industry in the Limpopo Province, South Africa. M.Sc. Agric. dissertation. University of the Free State, Bloemfontein, South Africa.
[994] PMF Newsletter OCTOBER 2016; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - HG de Waal - Version 5.0

- The control of predators from the air is described in the Best Practices for Predation Management as a remedial measure. The protocol for shooting from helicopters was accepted by the PMF as shown on the PMF website - www.pmfsa.co.za/images/news/Helikopterjag.pdf

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter OCTOBER 2016[995]:

> *"**Structured predation management programme should be in place for February jackal breeding***
>
> *The presence of predators on the farm should be monitored continuously. It is essential to have an excellent knowledge of the farm, as well as the areas where predators are generally found. This continuous monitoring usually focuses on the life cycles of the various predators. For example, in the case of the black-backed jackal, it is very important to detect their breeding holes and manage them professionally, especially in August. Another important time of the year is February, when young jackal from outside the farm's borders are looking for new homes. During these periods in particular, the farmer should schedule his time well in order to control and manage predators; in other words, a structured predation management programme should be in place.*
>
> *Read more about Integrated Predation Management in the recently launched Predation Management manual, the farmer's one-stop guide to identifying and managing predators, which appears on the PMF website. Click here for more info: www.pmfsa.co.za/images/news/Manual_Engels.pdf"*

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMF Newsletter NOVEMBER 2016[996]:

- **Western Cape Forum boast with good cooperation between role players**
- The Western Cape Wildlife Forum (WCWF) is a forum that meets twice per year and was cleared into being a couple of years ago by Helen Zille. The aim of the WCWF is to investigate the effect of predation and its effect on agriculture in the Western Cape. Another goal is to bring different stakeholders together around the same table to find and implement solutions.
- A meeting was held early in November 2016 between role players that included the Cape Leopard Trust, CapeNature, NWGA and Woolworths. CapeNature expressed its thanks for manual on predation management and congratulated all involved with the publication, which was regarded as the biggest achievement by the WCWF since 2013.

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter NOVEMBER 2016[997]:

> *"**Baboons a real threat to Karoo livestock farmers***
>
> *In response to a question by a Farmer's Weekly journalist about the status of sheep predation by baboons in the Karoo, Prof. Justin O'Riain, Professor of Biological Science at the University of Cape Town (UCT), had the following to say:*
>
> *"Baboons are regarded as the number one pest species in Africa and cause significant damage to pine trees in plantations, raid crops and urban areas and more recently have become an additional threat to small stock in the Karoo. This has not been quantified by research but farmers are reporting increasing losses due to baboons, especially during the dry months of summer. Dr Marion Tafani at UCT is currently working on this problem using GPS collars, isotopes and questionnaires to understand the extent of the problem, and discover which individuals eat more meat and how baboons move on farmland. Her results will be presented to farmers in Sutherland, Laingsburg and Beaufort West in November."*

[995] PMF Newsletter OCTOBER 2016; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[996] PMF Newsletter NOVEMBER 2016; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[997] PMF Newsletter NOVEMBER 2016; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - Hio de Waal - Version 5.0

The Farmer's Weekly article will be placed on the PMF website as soon as it is published."

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMF Newsletter NOVEMBER 2016[998]:

- **No, porcupines do not eat water pipes because they are thirsty ...**
- Farmers incur losses when porcupines eat water pipes. Jaco van Deventer of CapeNature has and interesting theory about this phenomenon.
- He was not a good scientist and therefore cannot provide an explanation why they love PVC pipes. However, he has reared a couple of baby porcupines and could not put their food in PVC dishes, because they tipped the food out, and first gnawed the dishes. He does not think they eat it, but merely gnawed it to pieces.
- Farmers in the Porterville area where porcupines damage PVC pipes which are above the ground, experimented by cutting old PVC pipes in short pieces and strew it in the vicinity of the pipes. It did work! The best option is to lift the PVC water pipes about 40 cm from ground level and where it runs next to a fence tie it to the fence at that height[999]. It works very well.
- This phenomenon is also found with rats, squirrels and mice that gnaw the covering of electrical wires. Jaco suspect it is the nice texture that attracts them, the incisors of rodents never stop growing and they must continuously gnaw at something to wear the down. Many household devices and motor cars have set on fire because of short circuits after rodents damaged the covering of electrical wires by gnawing at it.

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter NOVEMBER 2016[1000]:

*"**First AgriSeta accredited courses on predation***

In October, the first of the newly accredited AgriSeta courses on predation and predation management was presented by Niel Viljoen at the Mkuze Game Reserve in Northern KwaZulu-Natal. This was the ideal location because Mkuze is the habitat of the big five, making it most suitable for tracking. Footprints from the smallest to the larger apex predators such as lion and leopard made the practical sessions a very interesting part of the course. The soft red soil captured each footprint perfectly; this was a big bonus for the students. They were able to compare the prints shown in the textbook in the classroom with the visual print in nature and found them to be a perfect match.

All three courses were well attended and a total of 50 people received training. The course consisted of theoretical, as well as practical, work. Identification and tracking, as well as the correct use of soft traps and cages were explained and demonstrated. Trail camera handling and placements were also part of the practical training.

At the end of the three-and-half day course, each individual underwent theoretical and practical tests. The successful candidates will receive a certificate indicating their proficiency in assisting landowners to identify problematic predators, manage predation challenges and achieve profitable livestock farming. The knowledge and skills gained during the course will also help to protect and nurture ecosystems and serve to guide decision-making and management strategies aimed at cultivating and supporting healthy biodiversity."

The 19th Meeting of the PMF Steering Committee was held on 29 November 2016 at the NWGA Head Office, Newton Park, Port Elizabeth. Excerpts of the minutes are quoted below:

"Attendees: Guillau du Toit (PMF Chairman), Leon de Beer (NWGA), Coligny Stegmann (SA Mohair Growers' Association) Willie Clack (RPO, Large Stock Industry),

[998] PMF Newsletter NOVEMBER 2016; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

[999] Editor's Note: This remedy was observed on the rocky terrain near Campbell in the Northern Cape, where it is difficult to dig trenches in the rocky soil and cover PVC pipes with soil. The elevated black PVC pipes are painted with silver paint to offset the effect of the heat of the sun.

[1000] PMF Newsletter NOVEMBER 2016; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Versions 2 - 10 are Final - Version 5.0

Gerhard Schutte (RPO, Small Stock Industry), Dale Cunningham (WRSA), Gerhard Verdoorn (Griffon Poison Information Centre), Magdel Boshoff (DEA), Bonita Francis (PMF Secretariat) and Prof. HO de Waal (UFS)[1001],[1002]. Apologies: Thomas Mbedzi (DEA), Petrie Maré (SAMGA), Adri Kitshoff-Botha (WRSA) and Mandla Lukhele (DAFF).

3 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the previous meeting, which was held on 23 August 2016 was approved on the proposal of Dr. Gerhard Verdoorn and seconded by Coligny Stegmann with the following changes:

*Page 4 – SAMGA contribution towards Niël Viljoen training. Original paragraph: The meeting was informed that for the interim, SAMGA have withdrawn their funding from Niel's predation training programme and channelled it towards PMIC. The reason for this decision was that the contract presented directly to Niel was declined **by him** because of time constraints.*

Page 6 – Point 7.3 – Leopards: Mrs. Adri Kitshoff-Botha reported that trophy hunting has been taken out of DCA Norms and Standards. To direct a letter to Adri to get the exact meaning for the statement. Needs clarification.

6 MATTERS FOR DISCUSSION

6.1** Predation Management Information Centre (**PMIC)

6.1.1 Service level agreements between Industries and UFS

Prof. HO de Waal, UFS provided some introduction and background to the establishment of a PMIC. The UFS do not refer to a business plan, as the activities are already on an implementation level and the Centre is already doing far more than outlined. He presented the activities and outputs of the Predation management centre information databases, namely: (1) Information resource management; (2) Information dissemination; (3) Research and data collection; and Reporting.

Business Plan: (1) The chairman felt uneasy to release funding for the PMIC without a business plan. The RPO felt the same and it could create problems. WRSA commented that a formal business plan is vital to any business because the objectives and long-term sustainability will be highlighted; (2) Leon de Beer referred to initial budget of R740 000 and reduced budget of R570 000 and raised the question how budget will be utilised to release current predation challenges for farmers on ground level. How were these budgets developed without a business plan?; and (4) Gerhard Schutte felt it unfair to request a business plan without knowing what the committed available budget is. Only then the business plan would be in line with available budget.

Recommendation: (1) As per the decision at the previous meeting, to proceed with the process; (2) Request UFS to submit a business plan. Take into consideration possible funding from DAFF as promised by DG at most recent meeting; (3) Approved budget of R442 766, which includes WRSA contribution of R25 000 (versus the proportionate amount of R144 650) is official budget for PMIC; (4) Leon de Beer emphasised that CWSA would require clear reporting on funds spent; (5) Prof. de Waal also indicated his intention to negotiate more funding from other institutions; and (6) Business plan to be circulated electronically.

6.1.2 WRSA budget

Dale Cunningham said that the income from WRSA is derived from membership. As from 2017, WRSA will be introducing levies at game auctions in order to generate funds

[1001] As shown by the content of the minutes, Prof. de Waal only attended by invitation portions of the agenda, specifically paragraphs 6.8.1, 7.1 and 7.2.3).

[1002] Prof. Graham Kerley and Dr. Liaan Minnie of the NMMU also attended by invitation part of the meeting only to give input.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal

for matters like this. However, WRSA are unable to commit to R150 000 for 3 years for this project, but indicated a contribution of R25 000 for 3 years.

6.1.3 Formulation of PMF as legal entity

Coligny Stegmann foresees a big problem in that each industry signs individual contracts with UFS to have the same job done. He referred to previous request that PMF register as a legal entity in order to sign agreement with UFS. In order to eliminate any awkwardness, he suggested that the RMRD sign contract with UFS on behalf of all industries - same procedure as with research projects.

Gerhard Verdoorn reiterated the fact that the signing of 4 agreements with UFS is a simple process and will result in just 1 report that will serve at the end of year 1. The same procedure is being followed by the UFS in agreement with other entities.

RPO is not a legal entity and operates only on a constitution and they have been able to enter into agreements with the UFS.

As per the instruction by PMF, Gerhard Schutte had discussions with auditor and would it be possible for the PMF to open a bank account, even if it just lays dormant. The example of the account and services of the NAHF was mentioned.

Recommendation: (1) PMF as legal entity to be finalised. Gerhard Schutte proposed that the process be started immediately. Referred to the example of the Animal Health forum; (2) Discussions on registering as a service provider; and (3) NWGA – to look at national constitution and discuss with auditor.

6.2 Niel Viljoen study tour to America (arising)

Bonita Francis reported that the date for the 2017 Trappers course has been finalised and a spot has been reserved for Niel Viljoen.

6.3 M44 device (arising)

Leon de Beer reported on various attempts between himself, Gerhard Verdoorn, Niel Viljoen and HO de Waal with Australian and American contacts to import M44 devices to South Africa. The issue however is that poison is associated with the device, jeopardising the process. The initiative followed a meeting held at Thomas River, EC where it was agreed that a pilot project will be launched and if the outcome is successful, it be rolled out to other provinces.

Coligny Stegmann referred to the efforts by HO de Waal and his contact with the Dept. of Health in order to obtain a permit to do research. The responsibility should lie with the department who will stock the devices, courses be done and permits be issued in order to obtain the device.

Long debate followed about who should do the necessary footwork in order to obtain the device and determine the source.

All in agreement with the following: (1) Process will be management in a responsible manner including training and protocol; (2) The execution will lie with the provincial authority. The source will be put to contact with the provincial authority to control stray dogs; and (3) Permit for the use of poison can only be issued by a competent authority (either national, provincial or local).

Coligny Stegmann does not agree that the device be used exclusively on stray dogs, because it is used in America for coyotes.

Magdel Boshoff said to be cautious how the use of M44 will be motivated as activists are using the same for gin traps.

Decision: To continue the efforts and be coordinated between Leon de Beer, Gerhard Verdoorn and Niel Viljoen. To communicate with HO de Waal.

6.4 Report on progress: Accredited training courses

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

Provincial nature conservation departments agreed that the training course by Niel Viljoen will be accepted as minimum standard with the provision that his training manual be approved to the provinces. Magdel Boshoff indicated that April 2017 will see such a meeting being organised. Copies of the Predation management manual were handed to Magdel for distribution to provinces.

6.5 Potential threat of protected areas on livestock farms

Letter addressed to SANPARKS and provincial parks were drafted. Magdel Boshoff reported on her attempt to serve the letter through the protected areas structure, but they indicated an unwillingness as predator management on reserves are not their mandate. She suggested that the letter be re-worded to request a meeting with the protected areas management authorities in order discuss cooperation and seeking solutions. To further use the research done by Liaan Minnie as scientific evidence to address the problem.

Decision: (1) Letter to be reworded to carry a message of cooperation and seeking solutions; and (2) Magdel Boshoff to advise who to address the letter to. Possibly even the Minister.

6.6 DAFF and DEA

6.6.1 Appointment with DAFF

The Chairman referred to appointment with DAFF, which proved positive. Need to organise a follow-up and a value proposition to be submitted, indicating a drop in predation and how much it will cost for all farmers.

Coligny Stegmann felt uncomfortable that HO De Waal was not part of the delegation, which he felt was necessary because of his participation at DAFF PHAKISA and presentation given there.

'Die Voorsitter beklemtoon dat alhoewel verskeie versoeke gerig is dat HO die besoek vergesel, het UV tot op daardie datum nog nie bekend gemaak wie hul verteenwoordiger op PMF sou wees nie. Na 'n lang gesukkel om 'n afspraak te kry, was dit 'n verkennende gesprek met DG. Daarom het ek by my besluit volstaan dat slegs verteenwoordigende bedrywe besoek vergesel.' ['The Chairman emphasised that although several requests were made to HO de Waal to accompany the group on the visit, the UFS did not until that time named their representative on the PMF. After many attempts a meeting was arranged which was only seen as a reconnaissance with the DG. Therefore, I have kept to my decision that only representative industries will attend the meeting.'][1003]

Magdel Boshoff explained the ministerial structures of DAFF and that the presentation made by Prof. de Waal at PHAKISA would not have had the necessary impact on the DG.

Gerhard Schutte said that one should take notice of the remark of the DG regarding the composition of delegation and he suggested that NERPO be approached to serve on the national forum. Willie Clack seconded the suggestion.

Decision: NERPO to be invited to serve on the national forum.

6.7 SKA (Square kilometre array) (arising)

According to Magdel Boshoff, it does not seem like a strategic environmental assessment (SEA) has been done. She needs to find out from the CSIR if the SEA actually provides for damage causing animals and if inputs can be made.

6.8 Stray dogs

6.8.1 Report on meeting with SALGA WC

[1003] Editor's Note: Prof. de Waal was not present during this part of the meeting to provide relevant information. However, no record exists or recollections of such alleged requests could be made regarding this important meeting.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

Chairman reported positively on meeting with SALGA WC.

6.8.2 Report on meeting with SALGA National

Leon de Beer reported briefly on meeting with SALGA National and that suggestion was accepted that they be invited to attend next Steering Committee meeting to make a presentation. Gerhard Verdoorn also made a suggestion to get discussion going with the NSPCA to access their viewpoint. Gerhard Schutte to circulate an article written by Annalize Crosby on the hunting of dogs. Decision: (1) SALGA to be invited to the next meeting; and (2) Gerhard Verdoorn to have discussion with NSPCA.

6.9 Report on WC Wildlife forum (WCWF)

Chairman reported positively on meeting with WCWF, who expressed huge excitement for the Predation manual.

6.10 Protocol for helicopter hunting

Magdel Boshoff enquired whether protocol needs to be included in provincial legislation as she is unsure where it needs to be implemented. Coligny Stegmann explained that the document was compiled to assist and protect landowners against astronomical costs being charged for helicopter hunting.

Decision: (1) Protocol to become part of best practices; and (2) If necessary, to possibly update in a year's time.

6.11 Norms and Standards

Magdel Boshoff provided detailed background on how the public comments are evaluated. Dale Cunningham relayed some discrepancies in the N&S, which WRSA will submit to DEA. The closing date for comments is 12 December 2016.

6.12 Predation management manual

6.12.1 Xhosa translation

Matter was not discussed – Mandla Lukhele not present.

6.12.2 The use of poison (Pg. 15 & 31 of the manual)

6.12.2.1 1080 Single lethal dose

Request by Peter Schneekluth to include article relating to poison in the PMF newsletter.

Gerhard Verdoorn warned not to be associated with Peter Schneekluth as he is operating illegally.

6.12.2.2 Trap cages

Matter was not discussed due to time constraint.

7 RESEARCH

7.1 PredSA (Scientific Assessment)

Prof. Graham Kerley, NMMU reported on progress with PredSA, which is on track with the projected timeline. They have further initiated the process to try and bring input from non-commercial farming of what their understanding is regarding predation. The first draft for scientific review would be available in March 2017. WRSA will be approached to follow up on their offer to support as well as the RPO for rounding off contributions for the budget.

Willie Clack enquired about the definition of livestock, as it is very extensive and whether PredSA include all in the definition such as Agents-, Animal movement-, Animal diseases acts etc. Kerley replied that it is not a legal document, but there is a chapter on law, where all the legal definitions will be covered. Important to remember that PredSA is a social tool used to inform policy – it has no legal mandate.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

Dr. Liaan Minnie demonstrated a prototype APP linked to a website which is a tool that can be used by farmers to capture real time images and location on predation. The following dynamics could result from research and management tool: (1) NMMU are able to do research on real time data; (2) More information captured on the website; (3) Immediate value to farmers as they can plot and map where predation problems are; (4) See if neighbours have problems; fix fences between neighbours; and (5) Possible sponsorship for phones for communal farmers – need to get real time information from communal farmers.

Decision: (1) The meeting is excited about the finalisation of prototype website and APP into a management tool for farmers; and (2) Regarding the manner in which information and images are collected, there could be some sensitivity in images. Discuss how parameters can be set in order to define confidentiality and sensitivity.

7.2 Predator training programme – Niel Viljoen

7.2.1 Course fees – predation training (arising)

7.2.2 Funding by Woolworths

Above matters were not discussed due to time constraint.

7.2.3 Monitor farms: Scientific articles

Liaan Minnie said there is definite scope for comprehensive reports but that he will have to meet with Niel in order to translate data into scientific article. Due to range of knee operations, Minnie was unable to executive some activities.

8. PMF BUDGET

The meeting discussed proposed budget indicating each expense calculated according to formula of predation losses per industry.

Gerhard Schutte remarked that many of these items carry the necessary merit for funding, but that the RPO will be unable to make required contributions for the next 2 years.

*** budgets were listed as priorities for funding.*

8.1 Existing budgetary items

8.1.1 Niel Viljoen study tour to America*

As per previous decision that 2 persons be delegated for study tour, Gerhard Verdoorn proposed and Coligny Stegmann seconded that only Niel Viljoen be funded.

8.1.2 Niel Viljoen Monitor farms – scientific articles (discussed under 7.2.3)

8.1.3 PMF Ad hoc budget

8.2 New budgetary items

8.2.1 Predation management training*

Conflicting viewpoints between Coligny Stegmann, Guillau du Toit and Leon de Beer regarding SAMGA's involvement and withdrawal from Niel Viljoen's training programme.

8.2.3 PMF website

Gerhard Verdoorn offered to approach a sponsor for the PMF website.

Decision: (1) To circulate the proposed budget electronically in order for industries to determine priorities for funding; (2) By the end of January 2017, industries to indicate what they can afford according to priority budgets; (3) To further indicate period of budget year; and (4) The opening of a PMF bank account to be investigated."

At the meeting of 29 November 2016, Dr. Liaan Minnie confirmed that there was definite scope for comprehensive reports on the demonstration/monitor farms, but it required a meeting with Mr. Niël Viljoen to translate basic data into a scientific article. Since accepting the assignment,

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

Dr. Liaan Minnie underwent several knee operations; therefore, he was unable to execute some envisaged activities.

Discussions by the PMF Steering Committee at its meeting on 29 November 2016 in Port Elizabeth highlighted the need for the PMF to acquire legal status (legal entity)[1004] and be able to close contractual arrangements with service providers such as for instance universities.

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter DECEMBER 2016[1005]:

*"**Progress with scientific assessment***

Project manager Prof. Dave Balfour gives an update on the progress made with the planned scientific assessment on livestock predation in South Africa:

• The PredSA website is fully up and running and you are welcome to visit it at http://predsa.nmmu.ac.za/.

• Lead authors (LAs) have been approached and a full complement of approved authors have been lined up.

• The first lead author workshop was held in November. It was very successful with all but one of the LAs being present (Dr Jane Turpie had Walter van Niekerk stand in for her). The team had the opportunity to get to know each other, to understand the inner workings of a scientific assessment and to make a first attempt at defining their chapters. This first, tentative attempt is called the Zero Order Draft.

• Prof. Balfour consulted with state veterinarians, NGOs, agriculturalists and academics to establish an approach that would ensure that they will be able to consult with the communities concerned.

• Following the request from the project custodian group (PCG) to ensure the realisation of both the representivity and the learning opportunity imperatives of this project, Prof. Balfour approached 12 black candidate authors and secured their participation.

• A scientific commentary paper was drafted and submitted to the South African Journal of Science explaining the PredSA project and what it hopes to achieve – all the LAs contributed to this manuscript. Early indications are that the paper could be published in April 2017."

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter DECEMBER 2016[1006]:

*"**Predation research projects***

The Red Meat Research and Development Trust (RMRD) manages the following research projects:

Project name	***Researchers***
Scientific assessment: Stock predation	*Prof. Graham Kerley*
Impact of predation on wildlife	*Prof. HO de Waal*
Jackal ecology on reserves and farms	*Prof. Graham Kerley*
Guard animals for predator control	*Prof. Gareth Bath*
Karoo Predator Project	*Prof. Beatrice Conradie*
Management of problem-causing animals	*Dr Louis du Pisani*
PMF Website	*Leon de Beer"*

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMF Newsletter DECEMBER 2016[1007]:

- **What does the law say about hunting with dogs?**

[1004] Editor's Note: This process came to fruition from 22 February 2019.
[1005] PMF Newsletter DECEMBER 2016; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[1006] PMF Newsletter DECEMBER 2016; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[1007] PMF Newsletter DECEMBER 2016; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

- The RPO requested Annelize Crosby, the legal and policy adviser of Agri SA, to provide detail on the legal position regarding hunting with dogs. She was also inquired about remedial steps available to farmers on whose farms illegal hunting occurred.
- The following steps are available to livestock farmers and wildlife ranchers as a result of vagrant dogs:
  - Laying charges of trespassing;
  - Laying charges of cruelty to animals according the Animal Protection Act (Act 71 of 1962);
  - Laying charges according to the Stock Theft Act (Act 57 of 1959) or the Game Theft Act (Act 105 of 1991);
  - Laying charges according to nature conservation ordinances;
  - Laying charges according the relevant municipal regulation, for municipalities to act;
  - Commence actions to recover damages from the owner of the dog if the owner is known. It can be done on the basis of negligence or on the basis of blameless accountability where complying with the requirements of *actio de pauperie*, meaning the damage was indeed caused by the animals; and
  - Shoot the dogs in self-protection.
- The comprehensive report by Crosby is on the PMF website: http://bit.ly/2huGX25

2017

On 2 February 2017, Mrs. Bonita Francis (PMF Secretariat) confirmed the invitation (date, time and venue) for Prof. HO de Waal to attend the PMF Steering Committee in Pretoria.

On 6 February 2017, Mr. Johan Strydom, a specialist predator hunter from Warden in the eastern Free State Province phoned Prof. HO de Waal for advice to obtain financial support for the manufacturing of his newly designed version of the "Silent Killer". Prof. HO de Waal has been invited on 2 February 2017 to join the PMF Steering Committee at its meeting in Pretoria on 9 February 2017; therefore he advised Mr. Strydom to contact Mrs. Bonita Francis (NWGA/PMF Secretariat) urgently in Port Elizabeth and request to have the item of "Silent Killer" included on the agenda for the PMF meeting of 9 February 2017.

The 20th meeting of the PMF Steering Committee was held on 9 February 2017 at the conference facility of the UNISA Campus, Brooklyn Pretoria. Excerpts of the minutes are quoted below:

> *"Attendees: Guillau du Toit (PMF Chairman), Leon de Beer (NWGA), Coligny Stegmann (SAMGA), Petrie Maré (SAMGA), Willie Clack (RPO, Large Stock Industry), Gerhard Schutte (RPO, Small Stock Industry), Gerhard Verdoorn (Griffon Poison Information Centre), Adri Kitshoff-Botha (WRSA), HO de Waal (UFS/PMIC) and Bonita Francis (PMF Secretariat). Apologies: Dale Cunningham (WRSA), Thomas Mbedzi (DEA), Mandla Lukhele (DAFF), Magdel Boshoff (DEA) and invited for specific input to* ***paragraph 6.5****, Mr. Sonwabo Gqegqe (SA Local Government Association, SALGA).*
>
> ***2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES***
>
> *Approval of minutes of previous meeting held on 29 November 2016 at the NWGA Head Office was approved on the proposal of Gerhard Verdoorn and seconded by Willie Clack with the following changes:*
>
> *8.1 Page 6 – Point 7.3 – Leopards (from Minutes of 23 Aug 2016)*
>
> *Adri Kitshoff Botha elaborated on the discussion and referred to the N&S for Leopards and the fact that it was decided that predators (DCA's) would not be included in the N&S for Leopards – it should be kept separately from N&S for DCA's.*
>
> *8.2 Pg. 7 – discussion regarding the prototype APP linked to a website that farmers can use to capture and record real time images and incidents of predators.*

Version 5.0 HO de Waal - Version 5.0

Decision: Regarding the manner in which information and images are collected, there could be some sensitivity in images. Proposed change in sentence as follows. "NMMU will continue to ensure that confidentiality is safeguarded in the final APP."

8.3 Budget: Leon de Beer reported that an official bank account for PMF was opened and that monies from PMF fund (ad hoc) was transferred. He explained that monies were initially kept in NWGA account, where it was managed as a PMF fund through PASTEL.

Because of conflicting emails regarding the bank accounts, some members expressed some confusion regarding the status of bank accounts. The Chairman reiterated the fact that the PMF expenses account have always been managed and audited in the past: He provided clarity: (1) Previously, the PMF did not have a separate bank account, but industry contributions for ad hoc expenses was managed and audited in a separate fund within the NWGA; (2) However, a designated bank account for DAFF funding for Scientific Assessment were created; and (3) Only recently, the NWGA opened a designated bank account for PMF ad hoc expenses.

4 ADDITIONS TO THE AGENDA

4.1 Leopards

Further to the discussion above, Gerhard Verdoorn referred to the unmanageable situation in the field whereby many leopards are killed on a large scale, due to the Department's inability to have a proper scouting follow up permit system in place. It is the mandate and responsibility of the Department to set the hunting quotas for leopards but many leopards are illegally removed from DCA and abused within provinces for trophy hunting on a problem animal. Legally speaking, that particular problem animal should be removed by the province. He suggested that the overall management of the leopard specie be reconsidered where-after meaningful quotas can be set aside to be allocated to hunters and DCA's. The State is abandoning its mandate to protect the animals.

Coligny Stegmann referred to the enormous problem experienced in the Eastern Cape regarding leopard management – top structures in provincial government do not want to get involved.

Willie Clack has another viewpoint that partnerships with government departments be entered into to render certain functions on their behalf.

Decision: Gerhard Verdoorn to write a letter on behalf of the PMF to the DEA to make them aware of the unacceptable operational procedures by environmental authorities regarding the management of leopards with a request that they take up their responsibilities.

6. MATTERS FOR DISCUSSION

6.1 Predation Management Information Services (PMIC)

6.1.1 Business Plan (arising)

HO de Waal emphasised the importance of an institutional memory and gave background on the process dating back to May 1993. Discussions and the way forward regarding coordination of predation management are remarkably similar to the current views. The activities of the Centre at the UFS will continue with the decreased allocation of R442 766, which is R135 000 less than the original amount budgeted. He stressed that the development of a system of coordinated predation management would proceed at the UFS, even if the required funds from industries have not yet been received.

The following seemed to be areas of concern: (1) If contracts are not finalised and registered on the UFS system by the 7th of a month, staff cannot be reimbursed and the UFS stand a chance to lose skilled persons; (2) Reporting to the four respective industries may cause delay in acceptance of reports and the transfer of next lot of monies; (3) The management of a website should form part of the PMIC. The RPO is of

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

the opinion that the website should become the responsibility of the UFS and they would like to see that all activities relating to PMF, be transferred and that it operates as a fully-fledged HUB for predation; and (4) HO de Waal cautioned that farmers may be confused if a second parallel system, as proposed by Dr Gerhard Verdoorn is set up and farmers are called on a monthly basis and telephonic assistance is rendered.

The Chairman reminded the meeting of a previous decision whereby industries decided that the PMF website and newsletter remains with the Secretariat, for at least the first year after the evaluation of the performance of the PMIC.

The Chairman is further of the opinion that services by Gerhard Verdoorn will not be in conflict with the PMIC, but rather be targeted to the introduction and image building of the PMF.

Decision: (1) Because not all 4 contracts are in possession of UFS, the commencement dates to be changed to 1 March 2017 – 28 February 2018; (2) PMF website and newsletter to remain with Secretariat as per previous decision taken in November 2016; and (3) Discussion at the next meeting regarding the centralisation of all activities within the PMIC.

6.1.2 Service level agreements between industries and UFS

HO de Waal reported that only 2 of the 4 service agreements have been received and he feels concerned that the process is proceeding too slowly. He again confirmed that service agreements for funding will be negotiated with other institutions and that UFS is not bound by the industries only to provide funding.

Regarding the aspect of Intellectual Property (IP), HO de Waal confirmed that the service agreements state that the information generated by the PMIC shall remain the IP of the PMF and the UFS. Processed information will be made available in PDF format to the PMF.

6.1.3 Formulation of PMF as legal entity

The Chairman referred to discussions with officials of the Animal Health Forum and foresees no purpose for the PMF to have a legal status.

The only negative of the service agreements, according to HO de Waal, is the fact that reporting of the PMIC will have to be done to each respective industry, whereas, if the PMF is a legal entity, only a single report will be required. The Chairman provided clarity on the decision that one report will be submitted to the PMF, which in turn will then be communicated to all the industry contributors.

Gerhard Schutte is still of the opinion that the matter be investigated taking into consideration that the PMF now have a designated bank account. He referred to incident few years ago whereby legal claims were made against member of Secretariat.

Decision: (1) Taking into consideration that the requirement for legal status for the PMF has become more necessary than just signing contracts, the Committee urged it is important to seek a legal opinion; (2) Matter to be referred to Agri SA's legal department in conjunction with Willie Clack; and (3) Willie Clack and Chairman to take up the responsibility.

6.2 M44 device (arising)

HO de Waal reported on his efforts to import devices from America and the specific requirement by the USA that the Department of Health must approve the importation of the capsules filled with poison. Once approval has been received, a pilot testing will be done in the Free State and Eastern Cape.

Leon de Beer referred to discussions with Johan Strydom who applied for the patenting of "Silent Killer", a device proving to be very effective in the control of predator control. To possibly negotiate some devices to establish a pilot project in collaboration with environmental affairs.

Decision: To proceed with processes that is currently under way.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

6.3 Predators escaping from government protected areas (arising)

Coligny Stegmann relayed the report on behalf of Magdel Boshoff:

"I raised the matter at the Working Group 1 (the inter-governmental forum responsible for biodiversity matters) meeting of 2 February 2017. The forum agreed to the establishment of a task team to identify the 'hot spot' (problem) areas, as it would not necessary mean that all government protected areas contribute to the problem. The task team would then need to propose measures to minimise/ mitigate the problem. SANParks and Eastern Cape Parks have both volunteered to be part of the task team, as well as CapeNature, KZN Wildlife, Free State and Limpopo. Working Group 1 members also requested that scientists be part of the task team. Proposed date for a meeting 20 or 22 March 2017.

What is required of the PMF?: (1) To nominate members to form part of the task team; and (2) To consider making Liaan Minnie part of the task team, but Angela from SANParks who was part of the research project, is likely to represent SANParks."

Decision: (1) The PMF approved the selection of Dr. Liaan Minnie to serve on the Task Team. To clarify who will pay for his costs; and (2) Coligny Stegmann to represent PMF.

6.4 SKA (Square kilometre array) (arising)

Coligny Stegmann relayed the report on behalf of Magdel Boshoff:

"Instead of doing an individual Environmental Impact Assessment for each dish to be put up, a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) for the area was done. The intention is to develop a coordinated environmental management plan for the entire area. The SEA report has been compiled and is up currently on the SKA website for public comment. I will forward the e-mail with the link, unfortunately the document is too large to e-mail. Due date for comments is 3 March 2017.

I have not gone through the report myself, but apparently predation management is one of the aspects to be considered, and for which a monitoring program should be developed."

Decision: (1) The meeting took note of the report; and (2) To give attention to the link requesting public comment for the compilation of a monitoring plan.

6.5 Stray Dogs

6.5.1 Presentation by SALGA

Sonwabo Gqegqe of the SA Local Government Association (SALGA) addressed the meeting and elaborated extensively on discussions he had with Leon de Beer on proposed initiatives to address challenges of the forum relating to illegal hunting and stray dogs. The possibility of identifying municipalities and using as a pilot project and achieving the following: (1) Awareness between hunting as a commercial industry versus it being a social activity – would need proper communication with the communities. They need to understand the impact of illegal hunting; (2) Assist communities to understand and appreciate the economic values of the industries – need to draw the line between acts of ignorance and acts of law; (3) Creating awareness if a bi-law is implemented; (4) Pursue all issues of awareness; and (5) PMF need to identify areas in order for SALGA to engage with municipalities where the pilot project needs to be established.

Mr. Leon de Beer regards SALGA as a partner because of their ability to communicate with total of 257 municipalities, which proves a challenge in itself.

A discussion followed on the implementation of bi-law addressing the licencing of dogs and ended up in discussions relating to the element of people within communication who are practicing illegal hunting. It is the viewpoint of Gerhard Verdoorn that the SAPS

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

is failing in the enforcement of the hunting regulations and that a possible link should be established between the PMF, local municipalities and the SAPS.

Willie Clack is of the opinion that illegal hunting with dogs has become a national problem, no longer limited to municipalities. Just as jackal, dogs need to be defined as a damage causing animal as they are no longer regarded just as a pet. This is however totally different approach to what SALGA is suggesting.

The meeting agreed that the two issues should be dealt with in different manner. SALGA requests: (1) Would require Forum to gather as much information according to experience and include the structure of law enforcement. Information can be used to structure a case/pilot project; (2) Forum to guide and assist and support with the challenges; (3) NSPCA should be included in forum discussions; and (4) Hunting is part of the culture of Xhosa men and differs from area to area – they should be an important stakeholder.

Suggestions to address the issues - Two separate issues:

6.5.1.1.1.1 Illegal hunting with dogs: (1) RPO requested a legal opinion from Annalize Crosby, Agri SA legal specialist. Issue should reside with Rural and Safety Committee of Agri SA; and (2) Circulate article by Annelize Crosby to members and the newsletter.

6.5.1.1.1.2 Stray dogs: (1) Utilise SALGA to portray the message of stray dogs to communities via local municipalities. Provide them with specific information and discuss specific outcome whereby pilot project be established in municipality. ***Guillau to look at example of municipality in the Northern Cape****; (2) Discussions with Magdel Boshoff, DEA regarding the possibility of writing the issue of stray dogs into the DCA N&S. "Vagrant dogs in urban areas"; (3) Adri Kitshoff Botha referred to provincial forums where issues of stray dogs are discussed. The NSPCA also have representation on forums. To attempt to get the issue back into the ordinances; and (4) Matter to remain on the agenda of PMF.*

6.6 Predation Management manual

6.6.1 Xhosa translation

Bonita Francis relayed the report on behalf Manda Lukhele, DAFF: No funding will be forthcoming from DAFF as all available monies have been allocated towards the Drought relief scheme.

Decision: (1) Attempt to give project to NMMU honours student whose field is language sciences; and (2) Agri Connect to continue with attempts to source sponsorships.

6.6.2 Trap cages

The meeting took note of allegations of brutality of trapped baboons. The PMF is in opposition to the misuse of methods whereby the abuse of animals is encouraged and the issue of animal welfare is not respected. Decision: (1) Declaration on the PMF website, navigating users to the code of best practice and correct application of equipment; and (2) Inform Jennie from Baboon Matters that the PMF is addressing the issue.

6.7 Follow up appointment with DG

The meeting discussed the necessity for a follow up appointment with the DG. The following suggestions were noted: (1) Representative from NERPO to be invited as part of delegation; (2) Delegation needs to be briefed before the time about the purpose of the meeting; and (3) Use the principles contained in Operation Phakisa as starting point in discussions.

Decision: The meeting is unanimous for a follow up meeting with the DG. Issues relating to Predator manual, job opportunities etc should be part of the discussions. The

Version 5.0 - HD de Waal - Version 5.0

aim will be to source money for the PMIC shortfall for the interim. Operation Phakisa is on another level.

7 RESEARCH

7.1 Predator training programme – Niël Viljoen

7.1.1 Course fees – predation training (arising)

Leon de Beer referred to the complexity of the implementation: (1) Payment by non-members – as some organisations contribute towards the funding of the programme and no membership cards apply, how do you prove membership?; (2) Sourcing of sponsorship; and (3) Large number of attendees are farm workers.

Willie Clack is of the opinion that the "freebie" days should be over and that a commitment for the attendance of a course be validated through the payment of a fee. Various methods to achieve this: (1) Electronic payments; (2) Level of farmer associations to be utilised as they have mechanisms in place; and (3) The more attendees, the cheaper the course fees.

Decision: To investigate how suggestions can be implemented.

7.1.2 Funding by Woolworths

Chairman reported on brief discussion with Tom McLaughlin, Good Business Journey Specialist, Woolworths and their willingness to attend to a presentation by Niel Viljoen. Possibly at the next Cape Nature Forum meeting in Western Cape.

7.1.3 Specialised predator training – accredited trainers

Leon de Beer referred to proposed framework whereby specialist training will be offered to professional hunters. Training will be focused on current hunters with good track records and thereafter apply no new entrants. This initiative will strive to increase the level of competence of professional hunters.

The RPO remarked that programmes should not be built around a person, but rather institutions.

7.2 Procedure regarding questionnaire surveys

The meeting accepted the principle decision that no questionnaire surveys will be conducted unless the researcher provides a formal copy of the institutional ethics as well as the mechanism to report the outcomes of such work.

7.3 Research progress reports

Gerhard Schutte briefly reported on each predation research project currently being conducted at the RMRD.

7.4 UCT – Research in Laingsburg

Gerhard Verdoorn spoke highly of journalist Heather Dugmore whose article appeared in Landbouweekblad. Important to retain the contact.

8 PMF BUDGET

RPO indicated that no other financial contribution will be made to any of the requested budgetary items as all available funding will be channelled to the PMIC.

SAMGA is unable to give predictions towards proposed funding requirements as their financial committee only meets the following week.

WRSA commented that the value of losses within the Wildlife industry does not seem to be an easy figure to calculate, thereby making the formula whereby contributions are based seem quite extensive. To continue with current contributions for the rest of financial year, but to approach WRSA Board for larger contributions in the following financial year.

Budgetary meetings of respective industries

Version 5.0 - PRO de Waal - Version 5.0

1. *NWGA*
2. *RPO – November*
3. *SAMGA – February*
4. *WRSA – October*

Decision: Proposed budgets should be presented to industries in September in order to submit to respective boards and councils for approval.

8.1 Existing budgetary items

8.1.1 Niel Viljoen study tour to America

Is actually R100 000 and not R200 000 because of only 1 delegate and not 2.

8.1.2 Niel Viljoen – Monitor farms – scientific articles

Leon de Beer reported that previous budget was covered by the NWGA and East Cape and Northern Cape RPO branches. Proportionate contributions by 4 industries are difficult to calculate due to number of required courses.

Some members felt that this function should reside within the PMIC in the future, otherwise the main objective of a coordinated predation management system is fruitless.

Willie Clack enquired whether there is a contract between Niel Viljoen and the PMF enabling the PMF to secure the information and knowledge base that has been built by Niel through contributions of industries.

Leon de Beer explained that an annual report is provided by Niel Viljoen and that accredited course material resides with the NWGA.

Decision: (1) The RPO indicated that they will request funding from RPO provincial branches who are not currently contributing; (2) To discuss the issue whether predation programs generated by experts such as Niel Viljoen and Gerhard Verdoorn should reside within the PMIC; and (3) SAMGA to discuss the issue of funding at forthcoming Executive meeting.

8.1.3 PMF ad hoc budget

Coligny Stegmann questioned some of the expenses as projected in the ad hoc account. There is some confusion regarding the different bank accounts and clarity is requested.

Gerhard Schutte suggested that in lieu of the opening of a dedicated account for PMF, that an audit committee be appointed to look after the affairs of the forum. Coligny Stegmann and Gerhard Verdoorn were proposed and seconded by the members.

Decision: Audit committee comprising of Coligny Stegmann and Gerhard Verdoorn to clarify uncertainties regarding expenses and report at the following meeting.

8.1.4 Awareness campaign

Adri Kitshoff-Botha reiterated the importance of building awareness on the predation issue and not to allow a platform for other role players to build onto their images. The Predation manual is an excellent source of information. To be pro-active in spreading the Code of Best Practices.

Willie Clack said that the marketing approach should be targeted at the consumer and not the producer.

Gerhard Verdoorn referred to many contributions made in the media last year to expose the message of predation and the image of the PMF.

Decision: (1) Let's continue with current efforts of media exposure. Do the most with what we have got; and (2) Marketing should be focussed on good practices and the fact that it is executed in an honourable manner.

8.2 New Budgetary items

8.2.1 Predation management training

8.2.2 Specialist services

Noted. Industries indicated that they do not have the financial resources for budget.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

8.2.3 PMF website

Leon de Beer reported that Agri Connect could not source a sponsorship for the website, therefore the allocated budget of R47 000 per annum. HO de Waal indicated that budgetary expense for PMIC website is much lower as per the PMF budget. Many see this function as duplication, but the effort is more on image building of the PMF and with the massive contribution of media exposure by Gerhard Verdoorn, the PMF will continue with efforts to get sponsorship.

Decision: (1) To proceed with attempts to get sponsorship for PMF website; and (2) Important for interactive liaison between PMF and PMIC."

The representative of the UFS signed four separate Service Agreements on 23 February 2017. The four Service Agreements were later also signed separately by the representatives of the NWGA, RPO, SAMGA and WRSA.

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter FEBRUARY 2017[1008]:

"Isolation (fencing), the key to successful predation management

The NWGA, in collaboration with the Queenstown District Agricultural Association (QDAA), is planning a Predation Management Information Day. It will be held on Rookwood, the farm of Swithan and Kate Webster in the Queenstown district, on Thursday, 16 March. The theme "Jackal-proof fencing can improve production and manage predators" will be discussed. Guest speakers will include predator specialist Niel Viljoen, Hendrik van Pletzen from Voermol, and Isak Staats from BKB. Webster will provide a short introductory briefing on the netting initiative. The areas fenced with netting on Rookwood will then be inspected.

This goes to prove Niel Viljoen's point: "Managing isolation is easier than managing predators."

No registration fee will apply and refreshments and lunch will be provided. Lucky draws will also be available. Please contact Kobus Grobler at 072 593 5601 if you would like to attend the information day."

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMF Newsletter FEBRUARY 2017[1009]:

- **Hunting with dogs – what does the law say.**
- Hunting with dogs is apparently an escalating problem. The RPO requested detail on the legal position regarding hunting with dogs, as well as the legal remedies available to farmers on whose farmer's illegal hunting occur. Online link: Article by Annelize Crosby, Agri SA Legal and Policy Adviser.

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter FEBRUARY 2017[1010]:

"Urgent public input on SKA required for management plan

The SKA radio telescope is being built in the Karoo. The only SKA process requiring public comments has been opened and stakeholders are invited to submit comments about and their input on the "Draft SKA1_MID Integrated Environmental Management Plan". This is therefore an urgent call to all those affected in the SKA areas.

The CSIR has undertaken to do a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of the South African mid-frequency array of SKA Phase 1 (SKA1_MID), commissioned by the Department of Environmental Affairs.

Public comments are now requested on the Draft SKA1_MID Integrated Environmental Management Plan. Comments will be received during a period of 30 days starting on

[1008] PMF Newsletter FEBRUARY 2017; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[1009] PMF Newsletter FEBRUARY 2017; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[1010] PMF Newsletter FEBRUARY 2017; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

Wednesday, 1 February 2017 and ending on Friday, 3 March 2017. Please submit your comments and input by 3 March 2017.

The draft plan is available:

- *on the project website at www.skaphase1.csir.co.za; and*
- *at the libraries in Carnarvon, Brandvlei, Williston and Vanwyksvlei.*

The PMF Secretariat is coordinating the process and will send all forms to the CSIR before the end of Friday, 3 March 2017. You are therefore requested to email your completed form to nwga@nwga.co.za, marked for attention Bonita Francis 041 365 5030/082 413 6416."

As agreed in the Service Agreements, the Predation Management information Centre (PMiC) at the UFS officially became operational on 1 March 2017.

On 15 March 2017, an e-mailed invitation[1011] was brought to the attention of Prof. HO de Waal to make input on the "*Integrated Environmental Management Plan for the South African mid-frequency array of SKA Phase 1 2018-2023*". The deadline for submissions was 17 March 2017, but Prof. HO de Waal obtained permission to provide input on behalf of ALPRU on the long and extensive document (306 pages) to the Director-General Department of Environmental Affairs as quoted below:

"INTEGRATED ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR THE SOUTH AFRICAN MID-FREQUENCY ARRAY OF SKA PHASE 1 2018-2013

Background

Veld (natural pasture or rangeland) is utilised by ruminants as a major feed source in South Africa; it comprises about 80% of the land available for agriculture (De Waal, 1990). The veld is grazed by ruminants (domesticated cattle, sheep and goats) as well as indigenous wildlife; it is also utilised by other herbivores species such as domesticated equines and several wildlife species. The domesticated and wild herbivorous species are important in creating livelihoods for a substantial portion of the rural population and ensuring food security for the nation.

The large and medium-sized carnivorous predators are also important and for centuries have been part of the South Africa landscape; hence predation losses are not uncommon. Predation losses on livestock farms and wildlife ranches are poorly quantified. Recently annual predation losses on sheep and goats in five provinces were estimated to be more than ZAR 1.39 thousand million (Van Niekerk, 2010). Another study (Badenhorst, 2014) estimated annual predation losses for beef cattle in seven provinces at more than ZAR 383 million. A third study (Schepers, 2016) quantified the negative impact of predation on wildlife ranches in South Africa, which is comparable to those for livestock. Generally, the predation losses are ascribed mostly to black-backed jackal Canis mesomelas, caracal Caracal caracal, leopard Panthera pardus, brown hyaena Hyaena brunnea, cheetah Acinonyx jubatus and vagrant dogs Canis familiaris. A few other wildlife species are also causing damage but at a lesser scale and more localised.

In many parts of South Africa traditional livestock farming, but also other agricultural activities have been replaced by wildlife ranching. These activities rely on the same natural resource base; therefore changing from domesticated ruminant livestock to ruminant antelopes provides no escape from the negative impact of carnivorous predators. Hence, losses due to predation impact negatively on both the livestock and wildlife ranching industries. Large tracks of South African landscape are devoted to

[1011] You are invited to submit comments and inputs on the Draft SKA1_MID Integrated Environmental Management Plan during a period of 30 days, from Wednesday 01 February 2017 until Friday 03 March 2017. Completed forms must be sent to CSIR before the end of Friday 3 March 2017, via email to SKAPhase1@csir.co.za, or via post to "PO BOX 320, 7600 STELLENBOSCH".

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal Version 5.0

national parks (SANParks) and provincial nature reserves; bordering on livestock farms and wildlife ranches. Similarly, public land (devoted to military activities, municipal commonages, etc.) is also bordering agricultural farmland. These borders are sources of continuous human-wildlife conflict, specifically predation and must be managed.

Potentially, developments regarding the SKA (Square Kilometre Array) in the Northern Cape will have similar unintended consequences for a traditional sheep farming region. By changing large areas of farmland which was previously devoted to sheep farming to this Project will create human-wildlife conflict which must be pre-empted and managed.

Solutions to manage the challenges regarding human-wildlife conflict in South Africa call for a common South African institutional memory. Important information is currently kept in different official databases by nine provincial and national departments; apparently these sources are filed without being integrated and often in total isolation from each other. On the other hand, the overwhelming majority of information on predation and hunting of predators is privately held by a large number of specialist predator hunters and farmers. Again, there is no integration with other private and public sources of information.

In an ideal system of coordinated predation management (CPM) the farmers and government are equal partners; each with specific responsibilities. The former is responsible for policy, coordination, extension, training, research, monitoring and effective communication, while the livestock farmers and wildlife ranchers are responsible to protect their animals and control predators. An important element of the system of CPM is an institutional memory or management information system (MIS); it is the pivot for common information, planning, leadership and guidance for predation management and to prevent fragmented and uncoordinated actions.

Relevant information regarding predation and predation management methods must be collated and analysed continuously and made available in the MIS to guide the specialists in predation management more effectively. The MIS is a national asset and the information must be readily available for all users.

Good information regarding predation and different control methods are important components of a system of CPM. The institutional memory serves as central information source and should quickly provide practical answers on the following type of questions:

- *Which areas are reporting predation losses (species involved)?*
- *Is there a relation between reported cases of predation and the predation management?*
- *Is there a decline in reported cases of predation following predation management?*
- *What are the results achieved with different predation management methods?*
- *Which relevant questions must be resolved through directed scientific research?*
- *Who are the recognised and proven role players (e.g. specialists in managing predators)?*

The MIS must maintain (in real time) a range of information sets (electronic/hard copy) and integrate it in an orderly system of CPM, for example:

- *Reported cases of predation (type of animal, where, etc.).*
- *Reported cases of predation control (method used, species, sex, date, time, etc.).*
- *Contacts of government departments and functional offices/staff who are involved with the initiative.*
- *Contacts of the PMF's and the livestock and wildlife producers' organisation's functional offices/staff who are involved with the initiative.*
- *Contacts of other role players (universities and scientific research institutions) regarding offices/specialised staff who are involved with the initiative.*

Version 5.0 - Hide Watl - Version 5.0

- *Contacts and relevant information regarding the fields of expertise of the specialist predator hunters.*
- *Detail regarding relevant acts, regulations and policies applicable to different aspects of the initiative.*
- *Contacts of the relevant departmental offices/staff responsible for enforcement of regulations and issuing of permits.*
- *Collection of publications (hard copy and/or electronic) on predators, predation and relevant associated topics.*
- *Collection of available management methods (non-lethal and lethal) devices or equipment (foothold traps, cage traps, collars, bells, getters, etc.) as well as the appropriate specifications and correct way to obtain, safeguard, store and handle the device or equipment.*

The MIS must be kept updated by the CPM; it is meant to lay the information basis for a continuous assessment of biological, physical, economic and social factors to make meaningful adjustments of the different elements of coordinated predation management. The MIS also serves as information source to identify and prioritise research needs requiring urgent scientific answers. Relevant information is urgently and directly communicated with all relevant role players for further action and application.

The current approach in South Africa to manage predation is fragmented and uncoordinated. Clearly, it cannot be allowed to persist (Bergman et al., 2013). The widespread scale and negative impact of predation on livestock farms and wildlife ranches calls for a focused and coordinated predation management and research programme to reduce (mitigate) the impact of predation and specifically to manage human-wildlife conflict (Bergman et al., 2013; Du Plessis, 2013; Du Plessis et al., 2015). Urgent revision of the enabling legislation pertaining to different tiers of government and specifically impeding regulations are required.

Against this background, ALPRU [African Large Predator Research Unit, University of the Free State (UFS)] and specifically its Canis-Caracal Programme (CCP) pursued its vision for a system of coordinated predation management (CPM) in South Africa and, since 2014, actively lobbied key role players, among others the PMF, DEA and DAFF.

The PMF was founded in 2009 and comprises livestock and wildlife producer organisations, namely the Red Meat Producers' Organisation (RPO), the National Wool Growers' Association (NWGA), the South African Mohair Growers' Association (SAMGA) and Wildlife Ranching South Africa (WRSA). In addition the Griffon Poison Information Centre (GPIC), Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA) and Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (DAFF) are also represented on the PMF Steering Committee.

The PMF management engaged with the UFS and, recognising the vision and capacity of specialist scientists, requested the UFS at the end of 2016 to establish a Predation Management Information Centre (PMiC) and provide specific services regarding predation management in South Africa.

The specific request by the PMF has lent impetus to ALPRU/CCP to accelerate the process in developing the existing information management system which ALPRU has been piloting along similar lines since 2004.

The way forward

As stated previously the developments regarding the SKA will have unintended consequences for a traditional sheep farming region. The potential human-wildlife conflict must be pre-empted and managed.

The black-backed jackal and caracal are the predominant medium-sized predator species in the area. The first line of defence for livestock farmers to mitigate the impact of predation is a good perimeter fence. Therefore, ensuring that appropriate fences are

Version 5.0 Home Wear Version 5.0

erected and maintained on the perimeter of the SKA and adjacent farmland is a high priority.

As the envisaged area covered by SKA operations increases (chapter 5, paragraph 1, p 53), the existing fences must be upgraded to comply with minimum specifications to exclude predators from farmland. The construction and/or upgrading of these fences should be for the account of SKA. The fences must be accessible for vehicles and patrolled regularly to detect and repair any defects (burrowing animals such as aardvark or warthog and possible damage by rainwater along waterways). The regular inspection and maintenance of fences between properties are the joint responsibility of good neighbours.

Although the predators will prey on indigenous available fauna on the SKA properties, it is inevitable that they will soon try to cross the fences and predate on neighbouring livestock. These predating activities will increase and reach peaks during the annual whelping of the black-backed jackal britches as well as the specific lambing season on farmland. The young black-backed jackals will start dispersing early in the year (February/March) and this will also put pressure on the quality and sturdiness of fences to exclude predators from farmland.

Despite all the best efforts to exclude predators with good predator proof fences from neighbouring farmland, it will still be necessary to manage the predator population size on SKA property. This will require the services of specialist predator hunters (call-and-shoot, foothold traps and cage traps) to control numbers on SKA property. Predation management practices will continue on farms. The information from predation management activities must be logged and used to improve best practices.

Given the vast tracts of land covered by SKA operations and the multitude of neighbouring farmers, it may be wise to set up a joint committee to enable liaison and coordination, specifically to manage predation but also to address other issues of common interest to both groups of neighbours.

Good neighbourly relations must be established and fostered between SKA and neighbouring farmers. It is widely perceived that SKA is the "invader" of traditional farmland, therefore having good neighbourly relations should be a very high priority since the expected lifetime of the SKA is about 50 years.

References

Badenhorst, C.G., 2014. The cost of large stock predation in the North West Province. M.Sc. Agric. dissertation. University of the Free State, Bloemfontein, South Africa.

Bergman, D.L., De Waal, H.O., Avenant, N.L., Bodenchuk, M.J., Marlow, M.C. & Dale, D.L., 2013. The need to address black-backed jackal and caracal predation in South Africa. Proceedings 15th Wildlife Damage Management Conference, 25-28 March 2013, Clemson, South Carolina (J.B. Armstrong, G.R. Gallagher, Eds.).

De Waal, H.O., 1990. Animal production from native pasture (veld) in the Free State Region - a perspective of the grazing ruminant. South African Journal of Animal Science 20, 1-9.

Du Plessis, J., 2013. Towards the development of a sustainable management strategy for Canis mesomelas and Caracal caracal on rangeland. Ph.D. thesis. University of the Free State, Bloemfontein, South Africa.

Du Plessis, J.J., Avenant, N.L. & De Waal, H.O., 2015. Quality and quantity of the scientific information available on black-backed jackals and caracals: contributing to human-predator conflict management? African Journal of Wildlife Research 45(2): 138-157.

Gunter, Quinette, 2008. A critical evaluation of historical data on two damage causing predators, Canis mesomelas and Caracal caracal. M.Sc. dissertation. University of the Free State, Bloemfontein, South Africa.

Version 5.0 - For Award - Version 2.0

Schepers, Anche, 2016. The economic impact of predation in the wildlife ranching industry in Limpopo, South Africa. M.Sc. Agric. dissertation. University of the Free State, Bloemfontein, South Africa.

Strauss, A.J., 2009. The impact of predation on a sheep enterprise in the Free State Province. M.Sc. Agric. dissertation. University of the Free State, Bloemfontein, South Africa.

Van Niekerk, H.N., 2010. The cost of predation on small-livestock in South Africa by medium-sized predators. M.Sc. Agric. dissertation. University of the Free State, Bloemfontein, South Africa."

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter MARCH 2017[1012]:

*"**Predation management information centre now operational***

The University of the Free State has signed service agreements with all four industries represented on the Predation Management Forum (PMF) to establish and manage a Predation Management Information Centre (PMIC). The wool, mohair, red meat and wildlife industries have pooled their resources to create a space for collating and analysing reliable information on predation and predation management methods, which will be made available continuously to a management information system (MIS). This system, a national asset, will make information readily available to all users.

This information centre will be managed daily by dedicated staff, who will receive and manage calls and emails. Calls and enquiries will be logged and advice will be offered by the call centre and/or PMF specialists.

The centre will further be responsible for information resource management and provide the contact details of regulatory authorities and specialists managing damage-causing animals; it will also source all relevant policies of the national and provincial authorities. Scientific publications, reports, popular articles, best practices and PMF position statements will be sourced and archived. The training manuals of hunters, specialist hunters and livestock farmers and wildlife ranchers will be sourced and archived.

Another function of the centre will entail research and data collection, by means of which predation and predation management statistics, biometrics and new research topics will be identified.

We urge farmers, wildlife ranchers, civil society, the retail sector, regulatory authorities and any other stakeholder affected by predation to contact the PMIC at 051 401 2210 on weekdays from 08:00 to 16:00, or use the email PredationMC@ufs.ac.za."

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter MARCH 2017[1013]:

*"**PMF rejects inhumane treatment of animals***

The Predation Management Forum (PMF) represents the National Wool Growers' Association of SA (NWGA), the Red Meat Producers' Organisation (RPO), the South African Mohair Growers' Association (Samga) and Wildlife Ranching South Africa (WRSA). The PMF supports the responsible management of damage-causing animals and rejects the inhumane treatment of animals.

Best practices for managing predators in South Africa was developed by the PMF in support of ethical and humane methods to protect livestock and game against predators.

This declaration follows incidents of alleged brutality associated with trapping methods in the Western Cape."

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMF Newsletter MARCH 2017[1014]:

[1012] PMF Newsletter MARCH 2017; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[1013] PMF Newsletter MARCH 2017; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[1014] PMF Newsletter MARCH 2017; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - HD de Waal - Version 5.0

- **Vagrant dogs in municipal areas**
- Port Alfred and Alexandria in the Eastern Cape was involved in a court case and a successful court order was obtained against the Ndlambe Municipality, the municipal manager and the executive mayor to enforce regulation regarding the keeping of animals in the dwelling areas of the municipality, on municipal commonages and open areas. Repeated requests over many years regarding the uncontrolled influx of animals in dwelling areas were ignored. These animals increase the risk of contagious diseases to neighbouring commercial farms. Furthermore, the risks of vagrant dogs to motorists and private properties is self-explanatory.
- The court order was granted to Agri Eastern Cape and four other applicants. It is hoped this court order will be used as basis by Agri Eastern Cape's affiliated agricultural association in negotiations with their respective municipalities. Hopefully, farming communities with plans to address similar problems may succeed without have to resort to legal action. Read the press release: http://www.pmfsa.co.za/images/news/Agri-OK-Rondloper-Diere.pdf

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter APRIL 2017[1015]:

> ***"Livestock predation in SA: The need for and value of a scientific assessment***
>
> *Science can and must provide valid input into the challenges and policy needs of livestock predation management in South Africa. One of the ways in which this can be done is through the planned PredSA scientific assessment process. It is predicted that PredSA will give a much-needed boost to building transdisciplinary research capacity and raising the standards of research on livestock predation and management in South Africa.*
>
> *Click here for a three-page commentary paper on the scientific assessment*
>
> *Click here for a link to the manuscript"*

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMF Newsletter APRIL 2017[1016]:

- **Power lines and vultures**
- Caracals and jackals do cause much damage when they catch your sheep or lambs, but often eat only certain parts of the sheep or lamb and leave the rest in the veld. Then the vultures arrive and do the clean up work.
- This is exactly what happened recently in the Molteno area where a caracal repeatedly killed ewes of a farmer. The following morning the vultures were there. Fortunately, for the farmer the vultures revealed the problem with the caracal and at the same time, they cleaned the veld for him. However, there was one big problem – the power lines in the area was deadly for the vultures.
- On 16 March, the young farmer found three electrocuted vultures and a power line mast and two more vultures were seriously burnt and injured. PMF members investigated and found two more electrocuted Cape vultures[1017], as well as one that could not fly properly any longer. A week later, the farmer caught another vulture that could no longer fly.
- Fortunately, for the vultures, Eskom quickly responded to calls. Technicians are making the power lines safer for the vultures. Eskom also advised the farmer to drag the carcasses of sheep killed by the caracal away from the power lines to an area, which is safe for the vultures.
- Kate Webster, representative of Vulpro in the Eastern Cape and Free State, called on farmers where predators leave carcasses as food for vultures to drag the carcasses away from power lines to safeguard these endangered vultures from the danger. If farmers know of power lines which may be a threat to vultures or other larger birds of prey such as cranes[1018],

[1015] PMF Newsletter APRIL 2017; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[1016] PMF Newsletter APRIL 2017; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[1017] 'Kransaasvoël' (*Gyps coprotheres*)
[1018] Blue Crane - 'Bloukraanvoël' (*Anthropoides paradiseus*); Crowned Crane - Mahem - (*Balearica regulorum*); Wattled Crane - 'Lelkraanvoël' - (*Grus carunculatus*)

Version 5.0 - H de Waal - Version 5.0

bustards[1019] and secretary birds[1020], to contact the PMF. It will enable the PMF to cooperate with Eskom to solve the problem.

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter APRIL 2017[1021]:

*"**Isolation (fencing): the key to successful predation management***

Rookwood Farm, situated 35 km from Queenstown and home to Swithan and Kate Webster, recently played host to a predation management information day that highlighted the need to improve production and control predators through jackal-proof fencing.

The NWGA, in collaboration with the Queenstown District Agricultural Association (QDAA) organised the day, which was attended by more than 40 farmers, some of whom travelled long distances, for example from Graaff-Reinet, to gain advice on how to construct netted fences and practical exposure to this method of protecting their animals.

The speakers' talks dovetailed into each other on how to manage sheep farming properly and ensure its success. Hendrik van Pletzen from Voermol, stressed the importance of veld management, made possible through suitable fencing, and said that you had to make your conditions work for you (whether you got lots of rain or little rain).

*Predator specialist Niel Viljoen's talk on how jackal can penetrate jackal-proof fencing was particularly interesting and informative. Viljoen also emphasised that management plans were vital, and explained the situation regarding monitoring farms in each province, indicating how many of them used jackal-proof fencing. He discussed the method for isolating (*kamp uit*) the jackal and explained how one should deal with loopholes (literally holes that other animals create), as well as things such as gaps between or under gates that often allow jackal access to the farm.*

Isak Staats, from BKB, spoke about better production and the future of sheep farming. Presentations were concluded with a drive through parts of Rookwood where Niel pointed out practical problems regarding the current jackal-proofing erected on the farm."

A pilot project to test the "Silent Solution" of Mr. Johan Strydom, in cooperation with the NWGA and DEDEAT (Eastern Cape Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism) was conducted during the week of 5 June 2017 on the farm of Mr. David Wardle in Cathcart district. In this device, NaCN is ejected by a spring-loaded plunger and is a much-improved South African equivalent of the American M44, the South African Fox Buster (also designed by Mr. Johan Strydom) and the American coyote getter. Unfortunately, bad weather conditions hampered the testing process. Mr. Tim de Jongh (DEDEAT) was tasked to develop a framework for the PMF to make a recommendation to government support the use of the device to control stray dogs and predators.

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter JUNE 2017[1022]:

*"**Good collaboration in the Eastern Cape***

The Eastern Cape Predation Management Forum (ECPMF) gathered in May. The meeting was well attended by members of Agri Eastern Cape, Wildlife Ranching South Africa (WRSA), the South African Mohair Growers' Association (Samga), the Red Meat Producers' Organisation (RPO), the Endangered Wildlife Trust (EWT) and the Eastern Cape Department of Economic Development, Environmental Affairs and Tourism (DEDAET).

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

[1019] Kori Bustard - 'Gompou' (*Ardeotis kori*); Denham's Bustard - 'Veldpou' (*Neotis denhami*); Ludwig's Bustard - 'Ludwigse Pou' (*Neotis ludwigii*)
[1020] 'Sekretarisvoël' (*Sagittarius serpentarius*)
[1021] PMF Newsletter APRIL 2017; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[1022] PMF Newsletter JUNE 2017; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

The main topics of discussion were the finalisation of the provincial hunting proclamation for the East-ern Cape, the progress of the scientific assessment undertaken by Nelson Mandela University, problems experienced with organised dog pack hunting, Niel Viljoen's night hunting training courses, the mending of fences by Sanral and the leopard forum being implemented once again in the Eastern Cape.

Back[1023]: Coligny Stegmann (Samga), Henfred Linde (Samga), Brent McNamara (Agri EC), Juan Venter (NWGA) and HB van der Walt (NWGA and chairman of ECPMF). Front: Gerrie Ferreira (DEDAET, Jeffreys Bay), Rosemary Brown (RPO/NWGA), Leigh-Ann Kant (WRSA, Port Elizabeth), Dawid Smit (DEDAET, Queenstown), Lynette van der Walt (NWGA / ECPMF secretary) and Tim de Jongh (DEDAET, Queenstown)."

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter JUNE 2017[1024]:

*"**Night-shooting permits***

A memo was circulated by the Eastern Cape PMF, informing all concerned that professional predation managers (PPMs) must be in possession of a Seta-accredited certificate issued by an approved training institution to prove their competency in predator calling and management strategies. The PMF has come to an agreement with the Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA) and nine provincial offices that an approved qualification will be necessary as soon as the relevant logistics has been finalised.

PPMs with experience and who have underwent appropriate training previously may qualify for exemption to attend the full course through recognition of prior learning (RPL). RPL measures and mediates formal, non-formal and informal learning across different contexts, certifying it against the requirements for credit, access, inclusion or advancement in predation management. Qualifying PPMs will consequently only be required to attend specialist training in e.g. trapping and other specialist predation management methods for which permits will be required. Seta-accredited NWGA instructors are Niel Viljoen, Heinrich Funck, Hendrik van Rensburg, Louis Brink and Taffie Mulder."

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter JUNE 2017[1025]:

*"**Scientific assessment on track***

The scientific assessment has kicked into phase two, and now deals specifically with the assessment of information. The project leader, Prof. Graham Kerley from the Nelson Mandela University has elaborated on the processes in terms of which information is being considered and organised, assessed and written, reviewed by experts, revised and communicated, reviewed again by experts and stakeholders, before ultimately being revised for publishing.

A Process Custodian Group (PCG) was established to ensure that the process is followed appropriately and that the scope substantially reflects the interests of society. They will now recruit stakeholders to comment directly on the assessment. This is a very important process and members are encouraged to take part by registering as stakeholders at http://predsa.nmmu.ac.za/Stakeholder-Registration.

Scope

The scope of the project has been established and will be reviewed by 10 lead authors, 43 authors and contributing authors and 65 reviewers. The various chapters in the assessment are the following:

Introduction

History of predator−stock conflict in the RSA

[1023] Editor's Note: caption to a photograph.
[1024] PMF Newsletter JUNE 2017; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[1025] PMF Newsletter JUNE 2017; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 – HO de Waal – Version 5.0

Economics: impact of predators on the stock industry in the RSA
Ethical considerations in managing the impact of livestock predators
Legal considerations in managing the impact of livestock predators
Past and current management of predators in RSA and internationally
Role of mesopredators in ecosystems and the potential effect of managing them
Ecology of black-backed jackal and caracal and their interactions with livestock
Biology, ecology, and interaction of other predators with livestock
Synopsis of future research needs
Summary for policymakers

Prof. Kerley is hopeful that the completed assessment, which will serve as a guideline for policymakers who adopt the best-practice approach, will be launched at the 2018 NWGA National Congress."

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter JUNE 2017[1026]:

*"**Niel Viljoen website – A wonderful practical tool***

Predators and livestock farmers are engaged in an age-old conflict which is still threatening both sides, even in the 21st century. Niel Viljoen, predation expert, has created a website in co-operation with the NWGA which offers visitors an opportunity to look at research, training and advice in order to resolve this conflict.

To access the site visit: www.nielviljoen.co.za

All visitors will have to register on the website in order to gain access to the information and advice.

At the scene of predation, farmers are able to identify immediately the predator concerned according to their track and bite marks. A short questionnaire is also available that will assist visitors to the site in this regard. Photos can also be uploaded, posted and shared on the site, thereby cataloguing what is happening in a specific district.

The website gives comprehensive guidelines in assisting farmers in their choice of lambing areas, lambing times, as well as management strategies in erecting fences.

Predation management courses can also be booked through the website. A jackal calendar that divides the behavioural patterns of a jackal seasonally into 12 months can assist farmers in their predation management strategy."

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter JUNE 2017[1027]:

*"**Predation information centre***

Member organisations of the PMF has contracted the University of the Free State (UFS) to establish a PredationManagement Information Centre (PMIC), which took effect on 1 March 2017.

According to the project leader, Prof. HO de Waal, they are currently updating information on the national and provincial structures for environmentsl conservation and agriculture, which proves to be quite a frustrating and challenging rask.

Considerable progress has been made in updating the library of publications regarding predation and related topics, as well as legislation, hunting oridinances or regulations and permit application forms. An electronic bank has been established for photographed or video material, with material mainly from control operations.

The number of persons calling the PMIC [PredationMC@ufs.ac.za and 051 401 2210] for advice or offering relevant information is slowly picking up. A detailed report on the activities and progress made by the PMIS will be presented at the forthcoming PMF meeting."

[1026] PMF Newsletter JUNE 2017; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[1027] PMF Newsletter JUNE 2017; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter JUNE 2017[1028]:

*"**PhD opportunity in southern Free State***

Unisa and the National Museum in Bloemfontein is looking for a PhD candidate who will be required to investigate the following: "The spatio-temporal and dietary overlap between black-backed jackal and caracal in a small-stock farming area in the southern Free State". This is for a collaborative project between Unisa (Department of Environmental Sciences - Nature Conservation) and the National Museum. See the link for further details: http://www.pmfsa.co.za/images/news/PhD_ad.pdf"

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMF Newsletter JULY 2017[1029]:

- **Situation with poison gets out of control**
- According to Dr. Gerhard Verdoorn, the Griffon Poison Information Centre, predation is no joke and reach deep into the pockets of farmers, but it may often also be the catalyst for large scale irresponsible practices of which illegal poison may be the least acceptable.
- "*Fortunately not every farmer put poison out, but those that do destroy the ecology and cause irreparable damage. The past three years there were at least three cases where large numbers of vultures were poisoned because people laced animal carcasses to poison dogs or wild predators*," he said.
- Investigations are ongoing in the Northern Cape, Western Cape and Eastern Cape regarding individuals that poisoned predators. The poisons used illegally include aldicarb, carbofurane, methomyl and 1080. What the perpetrators do not realise is that the poison affects all animals. Duikers, steenbok, donkeys, sheep, dogs, korhaans[1030], secretary birds, vultures, leguaans, mongooses and many other species pick up poisoned bait and die.
- "*The central Karoo area is full of mountains and hills where Cape Vulture previously bred. Years of poisoning, as well as the drought of 1933, left the cliffs basically as monuments for Cape Vultures and currently only the white faecal signs are still visible in some spots*," said Dr. Verdoorn. "*Many Karoo farmers inquire about the possible re-establishing of Cape Vultures: my answer is simple that it would be impossible while there are still individuals who put out poison for predators. The cost of re-establishing is high and simply not feasible for those working with vultures to breed and rear them at great effort and then try to establish them in the 'shadow of death'*."
- "*It is a pity to say it so clearly, but it is often the absent landowners that do the poisoning because they want to protect their investments in the so-called scare wildlife. It is a travesty that wild animals and birds are killed because of this industry.*"
- According to Dr. Verdoorn, those using poison should note is that the mere possession of aldicarb has been prohibited the previous year. If the authorities catch you in possession it is sufficient justification for immediate arrest, criminal charges and jail sentence up to six years.
- Farmers should act together against those using poison illegally because the whole ecology of the Karoo may be damaged irreparably. A number of alternative predation management techniques have been developed and which are legal and effective. Please note that the use of the poison collar is legal, provided the farmer has obtained the necessary permit to use it from the conservation authority. Efforts are underway to reintroduce the use of the poison ejector again under highly controlled circumstances. It is also still illegal to use any pesticide in any form as bait in the veld.
- Visit the PMF website, http://www.pmfsa.co.za, for the best practices for predation management and obtain the PMF's printed predation management manual by applying on the website. Predation management is not as difficult as some people think and it are especially those that destroy the earth underneath us with poison.

[1028] PMF Newsletter JUNE 2017; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[1029] PMF Newsletter JULY 2017; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[1030] *Eupodotis* spp.

Version 5.0 - HOLDING - Version 5.0

- For inquiries contact Dr. Verdoorn - 082 446 8946 - nesher@tiscali.co.za.

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter JULY 2017[1031]:

*"**Stray dogs and livestock***

Members of the PMF met with the South African Local Government Association (Salga) and the National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (NSPCA) to discuss the issue of stray dogs that cause devastation to livestock (especially small stock) and to seek solutions to the problem.

The PMF regards Salga as an important stakeholder and partner that can play a constructive role in finding these solutions because of the organisation's ability to consult, network and communicate nationally with 254 local municipalities in South Africa.

The meeting decided that municipalities should be identified that could be used as examples of effective stray dog management. Salga could then consult with these municipalities about:

• cases of illegal hunting;

• instances where the NSPCA has been empowered by local government to assist with stray animal management; and

• instances where by-laws are enforced successfully (and where partnerships are in place to make this possible).

Salga will meet with these municipalities to identify the reasons for their success and to develop a framework for implementation to be considered by other municipalities."

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter JULY 2017[1032]:

*"**Clamping down on dogs boosts small antelope***

Dr Gerhard Verdoorn writes:

As a conservationist-hunter-farmer-without-a-farm I have the privilege of counting many farmers as my friends and have access to their farms for hunting, conservation and farming-related issues. The first thing I look for on any farm are helmeted guinea fowl because, for some reason this bird epitomises a well-balanced farm with sound farming practices. Secondly, I take a keen interest in the small antelope, especially steenbuck, my favourite of all antelope. In the Eastern Cape, Free State and Karoo the mountain reedbuck is my iconic species whereas the southern grey duiker and klipspringer fulfil that role in the northern regions. The sad demise of the oribi all over the country leaves one at a loss for words as you traverse the grasslands and wetlands of Mpumalanga and KwaZulu-Natal.

Many farmers in the Eastern Cape Karoo have expressed their concern about the rapid decline of the mountain reedbuck on their farms. Many factors could be responsible for this phenomenon but all agree that deliberate poaching with dogs stands out like a sore thumb. Without revealing the identities of individual farmer friends, I hereby offer an account of how the species responds to stray dogs and poaching with dogs.

A beautiful farm in the northern parts of the Eastern Cape has never had a large population of mountain reedbuck. One always saw small family groups of perhaps three to four animals. The farmer came to the conclusion that the canines on the farm were responsible for the low number of this small antelope. He eradicated (not with poisoning!) virtually all the dogs and allowed only one working dog per household. Three years after that I went hunting mountain reedbuck on the farm and I was astounded at the large number I found. The animals were everywhere and I counted at least 80 individuals on just under 900 ha.

[1031] PMF Newsletter JULY 2017; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[1032] PMF Newsletter JULY 2017; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

A second gem lies further north and is decorated with hills, valleys, plains and dams. The farm has always had a population of mountain reedbuck but about six years ago the population plummeted due to poaching. On a specific day four years ago the farmworkers alerted the owner to the presence of a group of young troublemakers chasing the mountain reedbuck with their dogs. He succeeded in rounding up the group and their dogs up under the supervision of the conservation official and the police. All the dogs were shot under the said supervision, which seemed to have the effect of putting an end to the poaching. During my last hunt on the farm it was a great pleasure to encounter a good number of mountain reedbuck, some groups of which numbered 13 in total.

The moral of the story is that stray dogs and hunting with dogs are incompatible with the survival of small antelope. The tail to the story is that farmers should not expose themselves to real trouble by illegally poisoning or shooting dogs while they are among their handlers or shooting them when they are at their owners' premises. Make the effort to get the local police and conservation officers onto the farm and then take care of the dogs.

For more information or further enquiries contact Dr Verdoorn at 082 446 8946 or by email at nesher@tiscali.co.za"

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter JULY 2017[1033]:

*"**Integrated predation management***

What is integrated predation management?

Conflict between livestock owners and predators is as old as livestock farming itself and will probably continue for a long time. This is why continuous and sustainable predation management, coupled with a well-considered herd management programme and grazing system, is so important.

Successful predation management can be divided into three steps:

- *continuous management throughout the year;*
- *management before lambing; and*
- *management during and after lambing.*

Continuous management

The presence of predators on the farm should be monitored continuously. It is essential to have an excellent knowledge of the farm, as well as the areas where predators are generally found. This continuous monitoring usually focuses on the life cycles of the various predators. For example, in the case of the black-backed jackal, it is very important to detect their breeding holes and manage them professionally, especially in August. Another important time of the year is February, when young jackal from outside the farm's borders are looking for a new home. During these periods in particular, the farmer should schedule his time well in order to control and manage predators, in other words, a structured predation management programme should be in place.

The above was taken from the Predation management manual. To learn more, visit the PMF website - http://www.pmfsa.co.za/images/news/Manual_Engels.pdf"

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter AUGUST 2017[1034]:

*"**Annual forum meeting set for end of month***

The Predation Management Forum is set to meet in Bloemfontein at the end of the month for their annual meeting. The forum comprises members of the wool, mohair, game and red meat industries, as well as the national departments of agriculture, forestry

[1033] PMF Newsletter JULY 2017; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[1034] PMF Newsletter AUGUST 2017; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - Hoëe Wooal - Version 5.0

and fisheries (DAFF) and environmental affairs (DEA). Predator specialists and researchers also make up an important component of the forum.

At the meeting, the DEA will provide feedback on the status of the Draft Norms and Standards for the Management of Damage-causing Animals (Notice 1084 of 2010). The provincial forums will have an opportunity to enter into discussions with the DEA about activities and challenges within the provinces that require national intervention.

The University of the Free State will present a six-monthly report on the role and functioning of the Predation Management Information Centre. This will be the first report detailing the operational activities of the centre since its contract started on 1 March 2017. Plans for the next six months will be revealed.

The meeting will discuss the comments and recommendations the PMF submitted to the CSIR's long-term monitoring programme for predator species, which appears in Chapter 5 of the draft integrated environmental management plan (IEMP) for the SKA project."

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter AUGUST 2017[1035]:

*"**Integrated predation management continues***

Last month's newsletter highlighted the importance of continuous management throughout the year as an important factor in managing predation successfully. This month we continue with the topic of management before lambing; next month we will address management during and after lambing.

Management before lambing

Small-stock farmers do not always realise the value of taking precautionary steps when it comes to damage-causing animals. A lot of money and time is spent on managing production, for example the fertility of rams, the mating of ewes and the care of ewes during lambing. Just as important as the preparation of livestock is the preparation of lambing camps where measures need to be taken to counter the movement and numbers of predators.

Just as farmers need to ensure that there is enough food and water for the animals in the lambing camps, they must ensure that there are no black-backed jackal and caracal, the two main predators, in the lambing and adjacent areas. During lambing, the air at night is filled with the smell of afterbirth and fresh blood. Predators cannot resist this and their instinct compels them to investigate. It is advisable to close these areas on the farm with jackal-proof fences and/or to electrify them. However, these two preventive measures are very expensive.

Lambing camps can be monitored by using cameras. Six weeks before the ewes start to lamb, the cameras should be placed in strategic locations in the lambing camps (at least four cameras per 1 000 ha). The more cameras, the better. It is particularly important to monitor the water points as well. Put bait right in front of each camera and intensify the scent every third day. Download the photos regularly and determine which animals visit the bait points. Being proactive and preparing lamb camps are essential if lamb losses are to be managed successfully. Waiting until the first lamb has been caught, is already too late!

The above was taken from the Predation management manual. To learn more, visit the PMF website – http://www.pmfsa.co.za/images/news/Manual_Engels.pdf"

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMF Newsletter AUGUST 2017[1036]:

- **Monitoring predation on 30 farms**
- **Aim of monitoring farms**

[1035] PMF Newsletter AUGUST 2017; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[1036] PMF Newsletter AUGUST 2017; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - RD de Waal - Version 5.0

- Seek answers, workable solutions
- Investigate various methods and management systems
- Provide farmers with advice, information and support

- **Northern Cape** (six farms – 55 460 ha)

Sutherland, Fraserburg, Loxton, Victoria-Wes, Britstown, Noupoort

- **Free State** (six farms – 14 355 ha)

Philippolis, Wepener, Trompsburg, Brandfort, Senekal, Vrede

- **Mpumalanga** (four farms – 7 063 ha)

Wakkerstroom, Amersfoort, Ermelo, Carolina

- **KwaZulu-Natal** (three farms – 16 600 ha)

Underberg, Utrecht, Luneburg

- **Eastern Cape** (seven farms – 34 040 ha)

Jansenville, Aberdeen, Hofmeyr, Jamestown, Bedford, Maclear, Dordrecht

- **Western Cape** (four farms – 28 600 ha)

Struisbaai, Laingsburg, Gouritsmond, Beaufort West

The PMF meeting was held on 31 August 2017 in the Board Room of the Agriculture Building at the UFS. Excerpts of the minutes are quoted below:

*"Present: **NWGA** - Guillau du Toit (National Chairman), Leon de Beer (GM), Thys Delport (Western Cape), Schalk Jacobs (Free State), Jan Louis Venter (Free State), **SA Mohair Growers' Assoc**. - Coligny Stegmann, Henfred Linde (GM), **Wildlife Ranching SA** - Adri Kitshoff-Botha (CEO), Johan Serfontein (Chairman Free State), RPO - Willie Clack (Large stock Industry & Gauteng), James Faber (Small stock industry), Herman Archer (Vice Chairman: Free State), Carine Annandale (Free State), Dirk Krapohl (Northern Cape), Koning Scholtz (Northern Cape), Hendrik Botha (KwaZulu-Natal), **ALPRU/UFS** - HO de Waal, **PMiC** - Quinette Kruger, **Researcher** - Niël Viljoen, **DAFF** - Victor Musetha, **Environmental Affairs** - Magdel Boshoff (DEA), Jaco van Deventer (Cape Nature Western Cape), Tim de Jongh (Eastern Cape), Gerrie Ferreira (Eastern Cape), Mazama Mpitshane (Eastern Cape), Nico Laubscher (Northern Cape, Calvinia), **Free State Hunters** - Daan Bodenstein and **PMF Secretariat** - Bonita Francis. Apologies: HB van der Walt (NWGA Eastern Cape), Machiel Odendaal (NWGA Mpumalanga), Bom Louw (NWGA KwaZulu-Natal), Sakkie van Zyl (RPO North West), Frikkie Wentzel (RPO Eastern Cape), Gerhard Schutte (CEO RPO), Thomas Mbedzi (DEA), Wessel Jacobs (Environment Northern Cape), Lourens Goosen (Environment Free State), Thys de Wet (Scientist), Michau Muller (NWGA Northern Cape), Koos Davel (RPO Mpumalanga) and Sam Makhubele (Limpopo Environmental Affairs).*

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the previous meeting, which were held on 24 August 2016 at the University of Free State was approved on the proposal of HO de Waal and seconded by Tim de Jongh.

5.8 Cheaper fencing: Koning Scholtz referred to previous request to investigate other material such as nylon, as different material could be a cheaper alternative. The chairman replied that such material are available, but at a much smaller scale than requirement for predator control. Scholtz proposed for further research on the matter.

Decision: A formal request to be tabled to the PMiC for research on appropriate material for fencing for predator control.

4. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

4.1 Feedback on the status of the DCA Norms and Standards and TOPS (arising)

Magdel Boshoff reported that all comments have been assessed and that the updating of N&S has started. Due to internal capacity challenges, DEA not on track with time lines

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

and should the document not be finalised at the end of October, another cycle of meetings will take place in January/February 2018.

On a question by Daan Bodenstein whether all comments and recommendations have been included, and it be necessary to workshop again, Boshoff replied that she cannot give an indication that all comments have been included, as the process still needs to be finalised. A workshop however will necessitate more changes to the document, prolonging the final stages. She does not foresee big changes coming from such a workshop.

Bodenstein said it is most worrying that N&S necessitates that an assessment be done after a loss, but questioned who and within what timeframe such an assessment will be done. Practical application of legislation seems impossible, he said.

Boshoff replied that it is critical to have some sort of information relating to losses, but also understands the possible impracticalities with a jackal for example. She will look into the wording in order to make it as practical and practicable as possible.

Decision: (1) Meeting took cognisance of the progress of implementation of N&S; (2) Meeting does not see the necessity for another workshop to review the comments; and (3) Regarding some impracticality in the N&S as pointed out by Mr. Bodenstein, Magdel Boshoff to relook at the wording to make it as practical and practicable as possible.

4.1.1 Uniformity in provinces

Thys Delport urged for uniformity in provinces as he is experiencing the reoccurrence of the same problems in the Western Cape, as the incidents are spread over 3 provinces, all with different legislation relating to accreditation.

The meeting discussed the mandate for legislation and learned that provinces can make their own legislation and that DEA is completely divorced from provinces. Magdel Boshoff is however of the opinion that even though it is not DEA's responsibility, that they can coordinate those issues that industry regards necessary for uniformity. It would depend on provincial availability and funding to attend meetings and discuss the issues.

According to Jaco van Deventer, to wait for the outcome of the N&S, as one of the objectives is to bring about uniformity of many issues, which will then be used as guidelines to bring provinces in line.

Adri Kitshoff Botha regards Wildlife forum meeting to be held in October as a platform to address this matter, as most of the provinces will be present. If certain provinces are not there and the aim of the meeting not met, then Magdel Boshoff to coordinate a dedicated day to discuss DCA matters.

Decision: (1) Industry to determine what issues regarding predation management needs to be coordinated; (2) Should provincial environmental affairs be in agreement with problems to discuss and address issues; and (3) Finalisation of Norms & Standards is critical as it will address the uniformity of issues within provinces.

5. MATTERS FOR DISCUSSION

5.1 Predation Management Information Centre (PMiC)

6-Monthly report and Presentation

The Committee took note of the progress report as contained in the Agenda.

Prof. HO de Waal presented the meeting with some historic information dating back to 1993.

Quinette Kruger, Database manager of the PMiC presented the meeting with a detailed progress report of activities since inception at 1 March 2017. She summarised as follows:

With all databases in place, the PMiC can now actively start engaging with stakeholders on the following:

- *Coordinating (district/provincial/national/international)*

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal, Version 5.0

- *Facilitating (training, discussion, monitoring)*
- *Liaising with all relevant people*

She accentuated the fact that nothing can be achieved without the input of stakeholders, which is the driving force of the PMiC. Want to provide neutral ground for all to come together for engagement and discussion. In order to achieve this, need to get to workable solutions in as little time as possible. Available information will be shared with the PMF before it goes to other stakeholder groups.

Coligny Stegmann appealed to all industries and individuals to be part of the process and make the system work.

Jaco van Deventer showed an example of a printed booklet that is used in the training of communities in the Western Cape whereby data is collected on an annual basis. They further have a protocol in WC whereby hunters and land owners cannot obtain permits unless they have supplied data on hunting and associated information.

Way forward: (1) PMF approved the 6-month report in principle on provision that progress as a percentage according to the outputs of the business plan is provided and a breakdown of calls to the info centre is recorded; and (2) Once industries have additional information, invoicing for the next 30% of budget will be done.

5.2 M44 device (arising)

Leon de Beer informed the meeting of a pilot project between Johan Strydom, NWGA and EC Environment to test the "Silent solution", the South African version of the M44 in the Thomas river district. Due to bad weather conditions, the testing process was hampered. Tim de Jongh (DEDEAT) has developed a framework in order for PMF to make a recommendation to government to support the use of the device in the management of stray dogs and predation.

Tim de Jongh presented the meeting with an extensive document stipulating the guidelines for the use of a coyote getter. Leon de Beer proposed that the framework be circulated to PMF Steering Committee; where after a recommendation to government can be made regarding the implication of devices.

Although confidential, Magdel Boshoff regards the framework developed by de Jongh, as valuable to include in the N&S. When DEA is ready to submit N&S for approval, the framework will already be a part of it.

Coligny Stegmann enquired about the lure for the device, as it could be a target for activists should lure other than urine be used.

<u>Decision</u>: (1) All in agreement with the proposal that Silent Killer be part of the tool box of predation control methods; (2) To possibly consider making the framework part of N&S; and (3) Project has been started – to circulate the framework to committee members.

5.3 Protocol for helicopter hunting (arising)

- *Coligny Stegmann clarified that the protocol serves as **guidelines** to be used by land owners as a control measure in order for helicopter pilots not to abuse the system.*
- *Koning Scholtz mentioned that he has certain concerns regarding specifications of e.g. helicopter models, etc.*
- *Tim de Jongh mentioned that the protocol will serve as guidelines/working document in the Eastern Cape where it is prohibited to hunt with a helicopter and therefore permits are being issued.*
- *Northern Cape – Civil Aviation requested to be informed before Nature Conservation issue a permit, in order to correlate the necessary charter licences being in place. Illegal activities such as operating without permits, to be forwarded to Nature Conservation to be relayed to Civil Aviation.*

Version 5.0 - Hope Wear - Version 5.0

- *Jaco Van Deventer indicated that permits are not being issued in the Western Cape, where they experience big challenges with stealing of game by means of using helicopters.*
- *Johan Serfontein, WRSA Free State referred to gentlemen's agreement amongst land owners to inform one another when using helicopters, especially regarding sensitivity of rhino owners.*
- *HO de Waal requested that data collected should also be relayed to the PMiC.*

5.4 Provincial report

Kwa-Zulu Natal:

Hendrik Botha raised concern that only 3 provincial nature conservation provinces are represented at the meeting, whilst the industry is strongly represented. He emphasized the importance of cooperation and collaboration on provincial levels and mentioned specifically that KZN Ezemvelo Wildlife is not involved at all on provincial level.

Eastern Cape:

Coligny Stegmann reported that regular meetings take place but that the problem regarding the non-issuing of DCA permits of leopards is still a concern in the Eastern Cape. Chairman also read message received from HB van der Walt, EC NWGA supporting Coligny's concern.

Tim de Jongh gave feedback that it is being controlled within the different regions where officials who experienced problems with "unethical" activities taking place in those areas handle it the way they see fit. Tim mentioned that leopards are much more prevalent in the Eastern Cape than originally thought. Eastern Cape has assigned "younger blood" to the PMF to ensure continuity.

Magdel Boshoff informed that where permit applications have been made and permits are not being issued, it means that there is a problem with the implementation of the Minister's … Proposed that in such instances, a letter must be written to the HOD, to be followed up with a letter to the MEC if there is no response and eventually to the Minister if no response. Minister need to receive the paper trail. Normally in such an incident, the Minister will follow up with the MEC.

Tim de Jongh reported that a proposal was made that the previous leopard committee become part of the PMF to ensure all the issues are being dealt with.

<u>Proposed Action</u>: (1) Tim de Jongh proposed a direct discussion with Eastern Cape manager (?), Mr Albert Mfunyana (??) which should also be attended by Mr Gerrie Ferreira to explain the blockages; and (2) Chairman agreed to follow that region before the November 2017 meeting.

Western Cape (Jaco van Deventer on behalf of Thys Delport)

A Western Cape PMF meeting planned to take place on 19 September, awaiting feedback from the 2 Ministers (Ministers Winde and Van Breda) if they will be available to attend. Problem in Northern Namaqualand area where the protocol concepts have not yet been accepted by industry, which Delport will follow up.

5.5 Adoption and underwriting of accredited courses (arising)

Report by Magdel Boshoff at 2016 meeting: 'Provinces have agreed to accept Niel's training course as the minimum for future training by training providers. However, the training manuals must still be approved by provinces, as they do not know what the content of the course is. Provinces to indicate when such a meeting could be convened. Niel to further indicate how/when his training manual can be made available to provinces.'

As there is nothing further to report and no further progress was made, Magdel Boshoff proposed that this matter becomes the function of the PMiC. From the reporting

Version 5.0 HO de Waal - Version 5.0

by the PMiC on their activities, it became apparent that this coordinated function should reside with them. HO de Waal accepted the proposition.

Magdel reaffirmed that all provinces are in agreement that Niël's course is the minimum standard, however to screen the course content in order for provinces to be comfortable with the issuing of permits. As DEA currently have a capacity problem, they cannot address the evaluation of course content and requested PMiC to handle it, possibly through electronic communication.

As the EC Dept. Environment have already started with process of informing people of requirements to show competency for night shooting, Leon de Beer sees the necessity to extend the programme to the WC, NC and Free State and seeks the necessary procedure to do so.

Tim de Jongh stated that the PMF have come to an agreement with DEA and all nine provinces regulate the night shooting industry and that Niel Viljoen is solely responsible for the AgriSETA accreditation training in SA. He read the email communication stipulating the requirements for competency.

Leon de Beer briefly explained the course framework for different courses ranging from basic predation courses at farmers' days, accredited training course and specialist courses which includes, call and shoot, cages etc.

Niel Viljoen thanked Tim de Jongh for pro-active steps to set up the procedure for the competence of hunters in the EC, but that he will have to do it province by province. It is of critical importance that the permit system is associated and in line with the accreditation, otherwise it serves no purpose. He is currently busy with provincial databases.

Decision: (1) To use EC letter as operational framework for other provinces; (2) Accreditation certificate to be placed on PMF website; (3) The modus operandi of Niel Viljoen is to liaise with provinces individually. To move from province to province; and (4) Magdel Boshoff proposed a meeting with 9 provinces at the end of November: (a) To gain agreement from provinces, as there are slight changes to previous; (b) Need another system (correspondence of Tim Snow) and have agreement on issues, specifically relating to what are the requirements of person who applies for permit; (c) Coordination of predation issues to also be a topic of discussion; (d) 1 & 2 November – Permit & Enforcement meeting – Tim de Jongh to take all proposals to that meeting. To possibly combine this meeting with the one that Magdel wants to schedule for the end of November.

5.6 Permission to apply predator control in nature reserves

Magdel Boshoff provided feedback on Predation Task Team meeting which was held on 22 March 2017 where the issue of predators escaping from government protected areas, was discussed. They determined that it was difficult to access hot spot areas, as they do not have enough information to justify, for example, were they actually predating or just scavenging. Hunting in national parks is not necessary in line with conservation objectives. Need to look at midway; neither hunting nor fencing will assist with the problem.

As with the Elephant assessment, what is actually required is a national strategy giving clear direction of strategic objectives with predation management. Instead of addressing ad hoc problems as they arise, to have a strategic document to address the issues.

Therefore the outcome of the meeting was not to identify hot spots, as they do not have the information, but to develop a national strategy and feedback was given to working group 1.

Magdel Boshoff proposed the following: (1) To not wait for the outcome of the Scientific Assessment, but to start developing the strategy soonest; (2) As DEA do not

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

have the capacity, she requested that PMiC develop the framework; (3) DEA funding for this project will possibly be derived from budget as presented to cover the shortfall of PMiC; and (4) PMiC indicated, should funding be available, that they will facilitate and draw in the necessary expertise.

5.7 SKA (Square kilometre array)

Report as distributed to all, for cognisance only. Coligny enquired about the procedure followed during the assessment period, of which the answer is unknown to the forum.

5.8 Predation prevention manual (arising)

Leon de Beer reported that the NAMC have been approached to consider sponsorship for the Xhosa translation of the manual. NMU students are also able to do translation at a much affordable rate, but then the professional layout, printing etc. needs to be added. Also considering only translating the stray dog chapters, this actually applies to communal areas.

Thys Delport suggested that former PMF chairman Petrus de Wet be approached to do the work, as he is fluent in Xhosa and understands the predation language.

As predation is predominantly rife in the EC, Tim de Jongh suggested that EC general manager regional basis be requested for funding for translation.

5.9 Predator fencing support

A similar initiative for cheaper fencing was again directed at cooperatives and suppliers of material according to specified specifications. Feedback from OVK and The Co-Op, Humansdorp indicated their willingness to consider participation. The Coop requires clarification regarding the need for such material as limited orders have been received, possibly due to drought and large volumes of fencing in stores due to similar initiatives the past 2 years.

<u>Decision</u>: (1) RPO and WRSA to test the demand for fencing with members; and (2) If not viable, to let the initiative stand over until next year.

5.10 SALGA

Leon de Beer reported that names of identified municipalities have been presented to SALGA to create a framework on how stray dogs and illegal hunting can be successfully managed. Another meeting with affected role players has been scheduled for 31st October.

Jaco van Deventer referred to the impoundment bill and the instruction to municipalities to contribute towards the compilation of such bill. Most municipalities have published bylaws for nuisance animals such as dogs. He referred to the Swartland municipality who applies impoundment and collect stray dogs for impoundment if necessary. Swartland Municipality could be another example of successful management.

Tim de Jongh referred to an article he wrote to The Representative (local newspaper) where they call on the municipality to apply by-laws. He wrote in his capacity as Community Policing Forum (CPF) in Komani where they tackled the issue of stray dogs.

5.10.1 Inability of Municipalities to enforce bylaws regarding dogs

No further discussion. According to Thys Delport, the point has been addressed.

5.11 Damage by animals other than jackal and lynx

Thys Delport referred to the grain and canola industries and the explosion of animals such as bush pigs, baboons, Egyptian geese (kolganse) and "spur wings" others who

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

are demolishing fields at an alarming rate within a few days. He seeks ways to manage this explosion of animals.

According to Coligny Stegmann, the responsibility of the PMF is to focus on predators that eat other animals – not on our level to address this.

Jaco van Deventer is of the opinion that the drought plays a significant role in the explosion of the animals, and there are unfortunately no quick fixes. Permits become necessary if there are more than daily bag limit. To supply information regarding birds.

In the Eastern Cape, people get an opportunity to put recommendations to the hunting proclamations every year, and if people see an increase in animals, the daily bag limited can be increased, said Tim de Jongh.

6 RESEARCH PROJECTS

6.1 Predation research

- *James Farber's report as distributed.*
- *HO de Waal explained that because of difference in values of species and areas, the study described and developed a base line cost and created a formula to be used, based on the wildlife on the specific land. HO de Waal reported that they are unsure of the effect that predators coming from national parks, have on small mammals. If not attending to predation management, we will not get a handle on domesticated as well as natural biodiversity.*
- *Coligny Stegmann used the decline in numbers of mountain reedbuck and springbok as an example in the area close to the CMZ National park.*
- *James Faber mentioned that it all comes down to a lack of information sharing between farmers/producers because of mistrust on how information will be used.*

6.2 PredSA (Scientific Assessment)

Leon de Beer presented a brief report on behalf of Nelson Mandela University (NMU) on the progress of PredSA. Stakeholder engagement for direct comment on the assessment has become necessary and is open to the public, and he invited industries and individuals to participate in the process by registering as a stakeholder.

HO de Waal remarked that they have communicated with the NMU that reference should be made to livestock and wildlife and not only livestock in the Assessment. Leon de Beer is certain that it does refer to both livestock and wildlife and that a typo must have creeped in.

Gerrie van der Walt referred to a presentation on "Conservation research fund predator project", which is in line with the aims of N&S for the sustainable use of large predators in SA. It is urgent that study be linked to SANBI and Gerrie undertook to take it up with them.

PMF members are requested to register on the PredSA website and comment as and where appropriate."

A person, who was present when the field trials had been conducted with the Silent Solution in the Eastern Cape, confidentially enquired from Prof. HO de Waal why some persons who attended the trial were advised not to cooperate with the group at the UFS. It was puzzling.

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter SEPTEMBER 2017[1037]:

*"**Have you experienced losses? Share your information with Predation Centre***

The Predation Management Information Centre (PMiC) is reminded daily of the importance of effective communication between the various stakeholders affected by predation management.

[1037] PMF Newsletter SEPTEMBER 2017; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 HO de Waal - Version 5.0

Various databases containing different types of information on predation have already been developed. The focus of the PMiC will be to coordinate the information in these databases and facilitate activities such as prioritising research, liaising between parties involved in predation management training and enhancing support by government departments. This is important if coordinated and effective predation management in South Africa is to be achieved.

A few individuals have supplied useful information on predation management. We appreciate the time and effort these individuals have taken to document the information and share it with us. The information was very well documented and detailed, which means that valuable knowledge can be extracted from it for wider application. By receiving more information the PMiC will be able to learn more about effective management strategies or best practices that apply in different situations. When this set of information is sufficient, it will be analysed and meaningful conclusions will be drawn and shared with stakeholders.

All information is dealt with as confidential: individuals will not be identified, nor will sensitive information on operations on specific farms or specific hunts be divulged.

Those who want to share information on predation, report experiences in predation management or obtain relevant related information, can contact the PMiC on 051 401 2210 or email PredationMC@ufs.ac.za."

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMF Newsletter SEPTEMBER 2017[1038]:

- **Bredasdorp benefits from predation information day**
- At the end of August a predation information day was presented at Zeekoeivlei, Bredasdorp; it participated the past five years as a predation monitoring farm. The Western Cape NWGA and Niël Viljoen organised the day that was attended by about 24 persons.
- Pieter Albertyn, the owner of Zeekoeivlei, discussed the successful use of alpacas as a management method. He said alpacas were recently for the first time offered for sale at an auction at Bredasdorp.
- Niël Viljoen, a predation specialist, demonstrated to set a cage trap for caracal and explained how to use foothold devices. The farmers who attended absorbed his advice. Niël's expertise is recognised countrywide and currently he managed 30 monitoring farms, among other near Struisbaai, Laingsburg, Gouritsmond, Beaufort West and Agulhas in the Western Cape. At the farms, different methods and management systems are investigated, implemented, tested, evaluated and monitored to provide farmers with advice, information and support.
- Philip Lötter of FarmRanger explained the collars that are fitted to the necks of sheep and the cell phones that alert farmers about prowling predators. The collars pick up abnormal behaviour of sheep, alerting the farmer immediately for further action.

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter SEPTEMBER 2017[1039]:

"Invitation to take part in the scientific assessment on predation

The Nelson Mandela University, previously the Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University (NMMU), has undertaken a scientific assessment of small-stock predation with the overall aim of:

1) documenting what is known, unknown and disputed in this regard by means of an extensive and transparent review process by both experts and stakeholders in the field; and

2) synthesising and communicating the information in such a way that decision-making and the reaching of social consensus is facilitated.

[1038] PMF Newsletter SEPTEMBER 2017; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[1039] PMF Newsletter SEPTEMBER 2017; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - HC de Waal - Version 2.0

During the past year and a half a project management team was appointed, as well as a project custodian group (PCG) which includes one representative each from the Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (DAFF) and the Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA). The PCG serves as the formal project governance structure. A website was developed, as well as the first draft of the assessment structure. The latter was achieved in cooperation with the lead authors for each of the 10 chapters and was approved by the PCG.

The first workshop (lead authors only) was held and the individual chapters structured in more detail. The co-authors (known as authors) for each chapter were invited to participate and attended a detail-oriented authors' workshop, resulting in the first-order draft (FOD).

A list of approximately 30 expert technical reviewers (eight of whom are international experts) was approved by the PCG. The FOD has been reviewed (except for one chapter experiencing delays) and the authors are attending to the review comments; the result of the latter will be the second-order draft (SOD).

The next step is to expose the SOD to stakeholder and public review, before the publication of the PredSA document can be finalised. You can participate in the PredSA process by registering as a stakeholder. As a registered stakeholder you will be able to make formal comments on the draft reports via the project website during specified "commenting periods". Please register via the following link: http://predsa.mandela.ac.za/Stakeholder-Registration"

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMF Newsletter SEPTEMBER 2017[1040]:

- **Determining the need for jackal-proof mesh wire**
- Once again, the PMF took the initiative and requested input providers to provide jackal-proof mesh wire are reduced prices to livestock owners.
- However, some input providers maintain the current demand for fencing material is low, thus not warranting the need for a special price. This is the result of the drought which limited the capital spending of farmers because of high feeding costs, as well as large volumes of fence material still in stores after a similar initiative the past two years.
- Members are tested to determine the real need for double galvanised mesh wire with 75 mm apertures. The specifications were approved by the PMF at a meeting. Contact Bonita Francis at NWGA head office -041 365 5030 if you are interested to purchase such mesh wire.

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter OCTOBER 2017[1041]:

"Niel Viljoen's study tour to the US

September 2017 saw Niel Viljoen leave South Africa on a three-week journey of evaluating, observing, studying and gaining a general perspective of predator management practices in the US.

he first week started with a trapper's course in Indiana, which was held at the Fur Takers of America (FTA) Trapper's College, which is the only one of its kind in the world. The college provides six days of in-the-field, hands-on training with some of the best trappers in the world serving as instructors. This extensive course included topics such as predator biology and behaviour, best management practices for trapping, the history of trapping, the various available traps and six intensive days of setting traps in practice. A typical day started at six o'clock every morning, after which the group spent the day in nature, evaluating and resetting traps and snares with some of the best trappers in the US.

[1040] PMF Newsletter SEPTEMBER 2017; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[1041] PMF Newsletter OCTOBER 2017; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - Hugo de Waal - Version 5.0

Back at camp in the afternoon, lectures went on until ten o'clock at night, and sometimes even later, as wildlife biologists presented lectures on their ongoing research and various aspects of trapping and the management of damage-causing animals.

The second week involved a packed programme of visits to the manufacturers of various trapping devices, a visit to the Coyote Research Station in Utah and talks with researchers and biologists on the latest ongoing predator research. Niel spent a day with a USDA specialist in the field and also accompanied a researcher from the Montana Department of Fish and Wildlife. He visited farms in Idaho, Wyoming and Montana, discussing managing strategies and predator control methods with the farmers.

The study tour concluded with an extremely interesting course, "Three days in the lives of wolves", which was presented by the Wyoming Yellowstone National Park. Niel attended an intensive course of lectures by a wildlife biologist, while also tracking the wolves daily, following their tracks in the snow while observing and learning a great deal.

Niel thinks the study tour gave him a massive opportunity to gain knowledge and practical experience. He was able to tap into the expertise and skill of academics, researchers and farmers and had the opportunity to visit world-class facilities. He is humbled by the opportunity and thanks those organisations, but in particular the National Wool Growers' Association of South Africa, for their large financial contribution."

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter OCTOBER 2017[1042]:

"Predation call centre focuses on predation in communal areas

Over the past month, the Predation Management Information Centre (PMiC) again received useful information from predator control operations, as well as photographic material of livestock losses being experienced in some communal farming areas. Thank you to everyone involved!

As they receive many enquiries on this topic, the centre's focus this month will be on managing predation in communal areas effectively. Communal farmers are suffering great losses, and often feel stranded in terms of how to address the problem. Livestock predation on communal land is difficult to address because, among other things, these areas are not fenced in, and are often adjacent to protected areas or other land use areas.

Since prevention is always the preferable approach to managing predation, deterrents or repellents are high up on the list of methods recommended to keep predators away from livestock. Therefore, the PMiC provides a list of deterrents with a brief description of each and the contact details of suppliers in a specific area that may be best suited to the specific set of circumstances applying to that area. However, for a quick response to immediate threats to livestock, it also supplies the contact details of predation management experts who can assist or give advice on predator problems in that area.

Unfortunately, very little information is available on the impact of predation in the communal farming areas of South Africa and how to manage it. Currently, the best source of information is on the use of guard dogs in these areas. According to Elanza van Lente, project manager for the Anatolian Shepherd Dog Breeding Project, well-trained Anatolian shepherd dogs have proven very effective in communal areas in Namaqualand.

For more information on the use of Anatolian shepherd dogs in communal areas, contact Elanza at: elanza.vanlente@sanparks.org.

A study completed earlier this year supports this statement. According to this study, 95% of the livestock farmers in the area considered these dogs to be economically beneficial and would recommend their use to reduce livestock losses. The title of the

[1042] PMF Newsletter OCTOBER 2017; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 – Home Work Version 5.0

study is "Guarding dogs as a mitigation tool in human–wildlife conflict. Case study: The Anatolian Shepherd Dog Breeding Project in Namaqua National Park" by E.N. Binge.

A preliminary study has shown that shepherding reduces losses considerably.

To read more about this, click on this link:

http://www.conservation.org/global/ci_south_africa/Documents/The-EcoRanger-Report_a-year-in-the-field_23082012.pdf

The PMiC advocates the use of the full range of non-lethal and lethal methods to mitigate the impact of predation. Therefore, please note that no single method, be it non-lethal or lethal, is a panacea or magic wand when managing predation.

Please share your experiences or knowledge on the topic of predation in communal areas or methods of predation management that work well in communal areas with the PMiC: Tel: 051 401 2210 - email: PredationMC@ufs.ac.za"

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter OCTOBER 2017[1043]:

*"**Integrated predation management (continued)***

Last month's newsletter highlighted the importance of continuous management throughout the year as an important step to successful predation management. This month we conclude on the path of management during and after lambing.

Management during and after lambing

If the farmer failed to act in the previous two management periods, this is usually when he realises with a shock that he has to do something. At this point the losses will be very visible. Farmers then start to panic, become discouraged and will often spare no expense to manage the predators. They expect immediate action with visible results and in most cases use lethal management methods. Do not lose perspective and try to poison the predators. This is not an option!

It is important to eliminate the animals that caused the damage. The call-and-shoot method is the most popular and effective.

Another option is the use of non-lethal methods such as deterrents using lights, sound, and scents. Do bear in mind that these management methods should be alternated, as predators will otherwise soon learn how to bypass them. It is wise not to use these methods at the same place for more than three weeks consecutively. By changing the techniques, problem animals will remain somewhat unsure and avoid the area.

At this point, more natural methods such as the use of lamas, alpacas, donkeys and sheepdogs can be used. They literally look after the livestock. These methods are quite effective, depending on the size and topography of the camps on the farm. These animals must be able to see both the predators and the animals they have to protect. Follow a proper management programme when using these methods and monitor the animals continuously.

It is important for a livestock farmer to identify the specific problem he encounters correctly, to have a clear understanding of the animals that cause the damage, to know his farm's topography and to show sound judgement on how to deal with the difficult situation. The expenses incurred must also be acceptable.

Put a sound and ongoing predation management programme in place. Do not manage the predators only during and after lambing. Make a mind shift and become proactive as far as predation management is concerned.

This is an extract from the Predation management manual, the farmer's one-stop guide to identifying and managing predators. Visit the PMF website to access the manual: http://www.pmfsa.co.za/images/news/Manual_Engels.pdf"

[1043] PMF Newsletter OCTOBER 2017; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - Made Wash Version 5.0

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter OCTOBER 2017[1044]:

A systems-thinking analysis of predator conflict management on selected SA farms

Tim Snow, a consultant in the fields of wildlife poisoning prevention and conflict management, as well as in all forms of wildlife management, released a study on "A systems-thinking based evaluation of predator conflict management on selected South African farms".

Click here to learn: Who is Tim Snow?

By evaluating predator conflict management methods from a systems-thinking perspective, and by probing learning processes, the shortcomings or failures of inappropriate management responses to conflict situations were shown to exacerbate conflict.

Contrarily, it was illustrated that application of systems thinking and a process of addressing the root cause of conflict issues in predator conflict management, was a longer-term solution. The study illustrated that the application of long-term proactive prevention and conflict avoidance principles can offer long-term solutions for predator conflict managers.

Visit the PMF website or click on the link to read the full article: http://www.pmfsa.co.za/images/news/1Snow_systems.pdf

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter NOVEMBER 2017[1045]:

*"**Municipalities and stray dogs***

Leon de Beer (NWGA) and Willie Clack (RPO), both representing the Predation Management Forum, recently met with Collen Rammule from the South African Local Government Association (Salga) to discuss the way forward regarding stray animals in and around towns and cities.

A number of municipalities were identified that managed stray animals by implementing bylaws and cooperating between various stakeholders. Salga contacted some of these municipalities, informing them that they would be visiting two of these municipalities with the PMF. One municipality in Gauteng and one in the Eastern Cape would receive visits. Salga undertook to facilitate the meetings.

Following the outcome of these meetings, a communication strategy will be followed to inform as many municipalities as possible of the challenges stray animals present and the impact they have on livestock. Discussions on illegal hunting on farms will also be included.

By adopting this approach the PMF hopes to inform municipalities of the threat of stray animals to livestock production, the health implications of stray animals and consequently put measures in place to address the problem by involving all stakeholders."

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter NOVEMBER 2017[1046]:

*"**PMiC seeks information for institutional memory***

The Predation Management Information Centre (PMiC) is requesting anyone who has access to any relevant information on predation management to pass it on to the centre. Examples of such information may be contact names or addresses, predator hunting records, losses on farms or ranches, old minutes, or publications. A wealth of old, existing, information on coordinated predation management is needed to recreate an institutional memory and to learn valuable lessons.

[1044] PMF Newsletter OCTOBER 2017; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[1045] PMF Newsletter NOVEMBER 2017; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[1046] PMF Newsletter NOVEMBER 2017; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - Hinde Wiegel Version 5.0

This type of information is scattered across the country and it has become necessary to bring it together at a central facility.

The Predation Management Information Centre (PMiC) Tel: 051 401 2210 email: PredationMC@ufs.ac.za"

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter NOVEMBER 2017[1047]:

*"**From the news desk of PMIC***

DID YOU KNOW?

- *Originally around 83 subsidised predator hunting clubs operated in the old Cape Province.*
- *Three large hunting associations were subsidised by the Orange Free State, as well as more than 30 smaller private hunting clubs.*
- *31 December 1965 – registration of these old predator hunting clubs was cancelled by proclamation in the Orange Free State.*
- *1 January 1966 – Oranjejag was approved by proclamation in 36 magisterial districts; hunting activities were subsidised.*
- *1 April 1967 – the remaining 12 magisterial districts in the Orange Free State were included by proclamation in the operational area of Oranjejag.*
- *18 November 1992 – the National Policy and Strategy for Problem Animal Control was accepted, and announced in a press release on 4 May 1993.*
- *4 to 5 May 1993 – the Problem Animal Control Forum convened at Golden Gate with high-level attendance by four provinces.*
- *15 July 1993 – Oranjejag experienced many challenges and was eventually dissolved.*
- *The Federal Problem Animal Control Association was operating in the old Transvaal.*
- *Private hunting clubs operated in Natal.*
- *28 April 1994 – Major geopolitical changes were implemented in South Africa; official appreciation for the impact of predation declined rapidly.*
- *June 2009 – The PMF was founded in Port Elizabeth."*

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter NOVEMBER 2017[1048]:

*"**Extension of period for commenting on scientific assessment***

The 30-day period for all PredSA chapters to comment on the assessment was extended to 10 November 2017. This would allow stakeholders time to integrate any of their comments on the chapter with the content of the legal chapter.

The comment period for the legal chapter (Chapter 5) will remain open until 27 November 2017.

Should any groups with specific infrastructure limitations be experiencing communication challenges among their members, they are asked to please contact the PredSA administrator (PredSA@mandela.ac.za) in this regard.

The Summary for Policymakers (Chapter 10) will be written once all stakeholder comments have been received and considered, and should be available for review in December 2017.

The draft report chapters are available electronically on the project website for downloading: http://predsa.mandela.ac.za/predsa-chapters-for-review.

A guideline document on how to comment on the assessment chapters (http://predsa.mandela.ac.za/predsa/media/Store/documents/PredSA-Guideline-Document-for-Stakeholder-Review.pdf), as well as a PredSA Stakeholder Review Comment Form (Excel spreadsheet) is also available for down-loading."

[1047] PMF Newsletter NOVEMBER 2017; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[1048] PMF Newsletter NOVEMBER 2017; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - HOAE Waal - Version 5.0

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMF Newsletter NOVEMBER 2017[1049]:

- **Are there mange jackals in your area?**
- Dr. Gerhard Verdoorn, of the Griffon Poison Information Centre inquires if somebody recently observed jackals affected by mange. The previous week he received a report from Vryheid in KwaZulu-Natal that all the jackals on Mawana wildlife reserve were affected with mange, while game showed no such signs.
- Contact Dr. Verdoorn - 082 446 8946 or nesher@tiscali.co.za

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMF Newsletter NOVEMBER 2017[1050]:

- **Predators and farmers: know your enemy**
- This is the first part of an article by Dr. Gerhard Verdoorn of the Griffon Poison Information Centre, emphasising the importance of predator identification. Contact him at 082 446 8946 for rapid diagnosis and advice.
- Few things are as upsetting such as finding a sheep or goat next to a trough at which an unwanted visitor has eaten without paying for the meal. It is understandable that anger may blur the farmer's discretion and mistakes will be made in identifying the culprit. Unfortunately, it also means that control measures are not effective and the problem is not solved. Many farmers simply assume a black-backed jackal killed the livestock, because it is the most well-known of the damage-causing animals.
- To determine which predator caused the damaged, the scene must be combed like a forensic investigation for possible clues. Look for the following clues:
  - Predator tracks – tracks[1051] of cats show no claw[1052] marks, while doglike animals and cheetahs do show claw marks.
  - Predator scat[1053] – some species such as the black-backed jackal may often defecates after feeding near the carcass to mark the area and protect it from other predators.
  - Type and size prey – the size, namely mature sheep or lamb killed, contribute to the eventual identification of the predator.
  - Bite marks – a very important clue to enable positive identification of the predator.
  - Feeding spot – usually a very strong and unmistakable clue to identify the predator and will also provide information to determine if secondary scavenging have occurred.
  - Feeding pattern – note if the predator ate at the belly or was it removed and how the carcass was eaten.
  - Claw marks on the carcass of the prey – it is primarily cats, such as caracal and leopard that make clear scratch (claw) marks on the body of the prey.
  - Predator hair – some predators leave some of their own hair on the prey.
  - Concealing the carcass – some predators cover the carcass after eating, while other do not do it at all.
  - Frequency of predation – the regularity with which predation occur, provides an indication of the predator involved.

2018

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter JANUARY 2018[1054]:

> ***"Scientific assessment now in its final stages***
>
> *The scientific assessment of livestock predation in South Africa (PredSA), formally launched in mid-2016 under the leadership of Prof. Graham Kerley from the Nelson*

[1049] PMF Newsletter NOVEMBER 2017; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[1050] PMF Newsletter NOVEMBER 2017; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[1051] Editor's Note: 'Spoor'
[1052] Editor's Note: Nails
[1053] Editor's Note: Faeces/droppings
[1054] PMF Newsletter JANUARY 2018; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - © de Waal - Version 5.0

Mandela University (NMU), is now reaching its final stages. Initiated to formally establish what we know about predation and livestock farming in a manner that is designed to inform future policy development, the output will be a 10-chapter book covering relevant details. It will also include a summary for policymakers.

Over the past 18 months nine authors have led larger teams of authors, totalling over 40 individuals, in drafting chapters covering historical, economic, ethical and legal aspects of predation on livestock. They also discussed ecological and management considerations and the implications of this phenomenon. To ensure the credibility of the final product, each chapter was subjected to three rounds of review. This was initially done by the other authors on the project; followed by a selection of national and international technical specialists and finally by the general public through a stakeholder review process.

As the goal is to produce a body of knowledge that can inform policy development, it was also crucial that the process was seen to be legitimate and salient (relevant), as well as transparent and inclusive (broadly participatory). To ensure that these qualities are embedded in the assessment in an independent process, a custodian group (PCG) was established, with representatives from industry and government, as well as the research community and civil society. Their role was to ensure that each step in the process (e.g. the selection of authors and selection of reviewers) was fundamentally fair. This group has signed off on the process at each stage.

The final draft of the PredSA assessment is scheduled for the end of March 2018 (in PDF format) with a printed book scheduled to be available for the launch towards the middle of the year.

PredSA team[1055] Dr Dave Balfour, Research Associate and Prof. Graham Kerley from the Nelson Mandela University."

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter JANUARY 2018[1056]:

"PMF to join forces with baboon damage interest group

Consensus was reached between the National Wool Growers' Association (NWGA), the Red Meat Producers' Organisation (RPO) and the South African Mohair Growers' Association (Samga) to attend a meeting of the Baboon Damage Interest Group (BDIG) with the specific objective of discussing the impact of baboons on livestock.

The BDIG was established in 1998 and is concerned about the damage caused by baboons and the fact that they are becoming serious threats to the sustainability of plantation forests in eastern Mpumalanga and Limpopo. The group further has concerns about the impact of predation by baboons on the sustainability of livestock production of small-stock farmers.

The BDIG intends to hold a workshop later this year with interested stakeholders, and have agreed to significantly expand participation to include other land users who may be affected by damage caused by baboons.

Although baboons do not fall into the main category of predators that are life-threatening to livestock owners and mostly cause damage to crops and forestry, the Predation Management Forum (PMF) still feels it necessary to get involved with the BDIG to discuss the impact baboons have on livestock."

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMF Newsletter JANUARY 2018[1057]:

- **Predators and farmers: know your enemy**

[1055] Editor's Note: Caption to a photograph.
[1056] PMF Newsletter JANUARY 2018; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[1057] PMF Newsletter JANUARY 2018; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

- This is the second part of an article by Dr. Gerhard Verdoorn of the Griffon Poison Information Centre, emphasising the importance of track identification of predators. Contact him at 082 446 8946 for a rapid diagnosis and advice.
- Best practice for a farmer is make good notes and take sufficient photographs of tracks with a cell phone. Often farmers provide a set of photographs enabling a quick identification of about 90% certainty. Place a reference such a pocketknife or cartridge shell next to the tracks, because 'a large track' does not mean anything. Such photographs can be send with a smart phone via WhatsApp for quick identification and advice with the problem.
- It is not possible to discuss identification in detail in this article; therefore, farmers are referred to website of the Predation Management Forum (PMF) www.pmfsa.co.za to access a range of information free of charge. The complete manual in both Afrikaans and Engels on predation management is also available to download. Farmers should at least familiarise themselves with the basic clues which may lead to an accurate identification of the predator – but let us provide an overview.
- **TRACKS**
- As stated previously, tracks may be used but it is important to photograph the tracks for identification by an expert.
- **Black-backed jackal** tracks are similar to a dog, with the fore and hind paws not markedly different in size. There are clear claw or nail marks in the tracks of jackals similar to those of dogs, Cape foxes and bat-eared foxes.
- **Caracal** tracks are slightly larger than the tracks of black-backed jackals, but without any claw marks. However when a caracal catch a large prey such as a mature sheep, there may be a few tracks showing claw marks because the cat is gripping to make the kill. Such tracks will also show many drag marks as the caracal was fighting with the sheep.
- **Leopard** tracks are the size of the palm of a hand and without claw marks. Tracks of fore and hind paws are about the same size.
- The tracks of **hyaenas** such as the brown hyaena[1058] (brown wolf as it is known to people in the Karoo) are large like those of a leopard, but clearly showing claw marks. The track of the fore paw is also markedly larger than the track of the hind paw for both the brown hyaena and the spotted hyaena. When the tracks of brown hyaenas are found, there is also a good chance to find the odour markings created with the anal glands on grass. Dogs are intimidated by these odour markings and when 'Fluffy' raises its hair, you will know the brown hyaena has left its mark. The mark is about 30 cm above the ground and is white with dark streaks, almost like chocolate, but the odour is very strong and almost like weeds.
- **Lion** tracks are very big and without any claw marks, but are seldom or never found on a common livestock farm.
- **Otter** tracks will be close to water and is oblong in shape. There is also a clear drag mark of the tail between the tracks.

The meeting of the PMF Steering Committee was held on 6 February 2018 at the NWGA Head Office in Port Elizabeth. Excerpts of the minutes are quoted below:

> *"Attendees: Guillau du Toit (PMF Chairman), Leon de Beer (NWGA), Coligny Stegmann (SAMGA), Willie Clack (RPO Large Stock Industry), Dale Cunningham (WRSA), Magdel Boshoff (DEA), Prof. HO de Waal (University of Free State/ALPRU/PMiC)[1059] and Bonita Francis (PMF Secretariat). Apologies: Henfred Linde (SAMGA), Gerhard Schutte (RPO Small Stock Industry, Adri Kitshoff-Botha (WRSA),*

[1058] Also known as in Afrikaans as '*strandwolf*' or '*strandjut*'.

[1059] Editor's Note: the Chairman requested HO de Waal to recuse himself during the discussions on finances and continuation of the PMiC; in the minutes some items overlapped and it may therefore create the impression that he was indeed present during such discussions.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

Thomas Mbedzi (DEA), Mandla Lukhele (DAFF), Quinette Kruger (PMiC) and Kobus Visser (Agri SA - by invitation).

3 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of previous meeting held on 30 August 2017 at the University of Free State was approved on the proposal of Willie Clack and seconded by Coligny Stegmann with the following amendments:

- *Page 2 – Research objective of PMiC*

Point 2.2 – paragraph 2 "Coordination does not ***make*** *that you do it……. should read* ***mean***

Panel of researchers with extensive knowledge on predation management research to approve research topics.

"Magdel Boshoff ***cautioned*** *to rather use wording……. Should read* ***proposed***

- *Page 3 – Formulation of PMF as legal entity (arising)*

*Point 6.1.2 – paragraph 1 "After discussions between Willie Clack and Annelize Crosby, Agri SA legal advisor, it has become clear that forums cannot be compared as they are not signing contracts and running businesses, as is currently the case with PMF, who have established contracts with the UFS…. Add the following.. "****through the NWGA, RPO, SAMGA and WRSA as intermediaries."***

- *Page 4 – Formulation of PMF as legal entity (arising)*

Take note of the comments in drafting a constitution: Industries with statutory levies versus industries with ***normal levies*** *…… should read* ***voluntary contributions.***

- *Page 4 – Shortfall of budget PMiC & DEA approached for funding*

Paragraph 2

Magdel Boshoff replied that DEA indicated that there are no funds available, but because it is not such a large amount, they might source the funding from ***somewhere else, such as implementation of Norms and Standards****… should read* ***other components within DEA.***

- *Page 5 – M44 device (arising)* ***"Ghetters"*** *should read* ***"Getters"***

Paragraph 2 Device can be used, but permit from Dept. Health is required. ***Add the following "for the importation of the substance.***

- *Page 5 – Potential threat of protected areas on livestock farms (arising)*
- *They determined that it was difficult to* ***assess*** *hot spots….* ***Should read identify***
- *As with the Elephant* ***Assessment*****…. should read Norms & Standards**
- *Page 6 –* ***Trap Cages*** ***should read Cage traps***
- *Page 7 – Leopards Paragraph 2 Magdel Boshoff is* ***adamant*** ***should read indicated***
- *Page 7 – Course fees – predation training*

HO de Waal referred to the intention of PMiC to start with a trapping course on campus, ***add conducted by Free State Nature Conservation.***

5. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

5.2 M44 device (arising)

There seemed to be a lot of confusion regarding the wording of M44, which was changed to read "poison getter". In the N&S, through public participation, the wording was changed to "poison firing apparatus" instead of "getter", which had certain negative connotations.

Decision: (1) In PMF circles, the word "getter" will refer to range of devices that will perform this function; and (2) DEA to continue with wording of "poison firing apparatus" in N&S.

6 MATTERS FOR DISCUSSION

6.1 Predation Management Information Centre (PMiC)

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

6.1.1 Annual report and presentation

Prof. HO de Waal referred to annual report, which is a month short of 12 months. Final input was made until this weekend in the report and it could not be circulated prior to the meeting: therefore, members were unable to familiarise themselves with the content. He broadly expanded on four headings of the report, namely Information resource management, Information dissemination, Research and data collation, and Coordinating. He commended Quinette Kruger when referring to the laborious task to update information on the nine provincial authorities, DAFF and DEA. Although comprehensive detail is presented in the provincial structures of these institutions, it still remains very difficult to get hold of many and some provinces most individuals listed. Often the person responding to a call is not knowledgeable about predation and the caller is referred to somebody else. Copies of this information will be provided to the PMF Secretariat for distribution on the website. He emphasised that the value or success of the PMiC should not be measured according to number of telephone calls and email correspondence, but rather how best practices in predation management are being applied.

Regarding the issue of Regulatory authorities and the problems experienced in the updating of information, Magdel Boshoff suggested raising the issue at DEA Permit and Enforcing Planning Committee – to provide her with the names of provinces where information is lacking.

<u>DCA Management specialist list</u>

HO de Waal referred to section 1.3.3 in the annual report and said that the PMiC is awaiting a name list from PMF of accredited professional hunters. The PMiC has the names of quite a number of specialist predator hunters and can provide some detail to a caller requesting assistance with predation control. No information is available on where the training courses are conducted, what the specific content, who is attending, etc. This information is much needed in the information bases of the PMiC. It seems there is also considerable confusion regarding the "approval/accreditation" of hunters by the PMF.

Leon de Beer is of the opinion that there seem to be a wrongful perception that the NWGA is the only training institution, where in fact there are many institutions such as the University of Free State for example, that are accredited to provide training. They just need to identify the trainees. The NWGA purely used its accredited structure to start the process of training and accreditation. Professional hunters still require the approval from provincial nature conservation for the issuing of permits, therefore very much a state function.

As there seem to be confusion between officials and hunters, HO de Waal requested that Leon de Beer summarise the explanation he has given and provide written clarification on the matter for the PMF website.

<u>Decision</u>: Leon de Beer to summarise the process and place it on PMF website.

<u>Summary of discussion PMiC</u>: (1) According to Coligny Stegmann, it is mind boggling of what needs to be achieved within the PMiC and it will take a number of years for the wheels to start turning. PMF to approach government for funding, when in actual fact the statistics for predation losses are not even known. He is aware of individuals wanting to jeopardise the process; (2) Prof. HO de Waal referred to PredSA and incidents leading up to point where some assistance offered by a group of colleagues (and specific comments) was ignored in the process of drafting the chapter on socio-economic impact. It seems that a colleague has wrongfully being accused of not contribution as requested. HO de Waal briefly outlined what has happened during the process and stated his views on the flaws in several other chapters; he also reiterated his long standing and well known commitment to the establish a system of coordinated predation management, leaving little time to him personally to participate actively in PredSA, except to provide assistance on request in making information available; (3) HO de Waal listed several incidences over a period of about nine years where definite attempts have been

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

engineered to side line or thwart the activities of the group at the UFS. It seems that the tangible degree of antagonism towards the PMiC was rooted in a perceived notion that the group at the UFS is duplicating work that is already being done by a specific producer's organisation. He expressed concern that efforts apparently persist to make sure that important data and information is not provided to the PMiC; therefore it is not given the space to operate and grow as it should; (4) On a question to Prof. de Waal regarding his involvement with the PMiC, he replied that because the initiative, guidance and contracts originated from his office, he remains associated with the Centre. He is no longer employed full time by the University, but does receive a professional retainer from the contract, which is much less than what is required to assist with the management of the Centre. He will remain an integral part of the specialists at the PMiC for the current and next year. Thereafter, the PMiC should be able to run as a full-fledged Centre at the UFS.

Continuation with PMiC and commitment for funding

As funding for Year 2 needs to be released, the meeting to consider the continuation of PMiC: (1) Leon de Beer – the continuation is a given; meeting to evaluate report against money spent the past year; (2) Willie Clack – project is only in beginning stages – cannot take a decision to stop it. ***Indeed yes with RPO contribute with statutory levy****; (3) Coligny Stegmann – need to have bigger picture in sight; compilation of business plans and intentions of Phakisa and making the state responsible for outcomes.* ***Indeed yes, as SAMGA have budgeted for the amount****; and (4) Dale Cunningham questioned the correctness of WRSA percentage based on losses. He explained that WRSA is dependent on voluntary contributions from members and is uncertain if allocated amount for PMiC will materialise.* ***Can only give an indication on Friday, 9th February.***

Decision: (1) The meeting decided to continue with the contract given the available budgets from respective industries; (2) Should funding of the PMiC by the PMF continue and taking into account that the PMF is not yet a legal entity as anticipated, the UFS will again have to sign individual agreements with respective industries as appropriate; (3) NWGA= R103 719; RPO= R311 158; SAMGA= R42 708; WRSA= R152 528 TOTAL = R610 115; (4) PMiC to provide state departments with business plans for the funding of structure. PMF to draft a letter of support highlighting the losses etc.; (5) New contract will be subject to available budgets and approval of the annual report by industries; (6) Should approval for funding from State be received, contributions from industries will decrease. As per the discussion and previous decision, industries to serve as interim funding agents until such time as the State are able to carry the function; and (7) Audited statements for the contract year to be provided to PMF when available.

6.1.1.1 Website at UFS

Prof. HO de Waal reported that a website has been reactivated at the UFS at no cost and that Quinette Kruger is attending a course in website management.

6.1.1.2 Interaction between role players and PMiC

Refer to detail previously listed in the minutes under paragraph 6.1.1. Prof. HO de Waal referred to specific incidents of antagonism detected towards the PMiC because it is wrongfully perceived to duplicate what is already being done by others. There is definite evidence of important information requested or needed by the PMiC being deliberately withheld on the advice of a few individuals.

6.1.1.3 Information: Monitor farms and training of hunters

Prof. HO de Waal reiterated the request for information on the monitor farms; where the farms are and the positive results obtained over the past 8-9 years. Such information is needed to be packed and widely distributed as best practices.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

6.1.1.4 Implementing recommendations from published reports

Prof. HO de Waal referred to document from National Problem Animal Policy Committee dated 17 February 1994 where a National Policy and Strategy for Problem Animal Control in South Africa was developed. This document and most theses and dissertations and many articles provide good recommendations but these are not implemented because [of the lack] of a dedicated implementing agency. Many old and more recent documents relating to Best Practices for predator management are being sourced and it should become the main function of the PMF and PMiC to ensure that this information is heeded without trying to reinvent the wheel. It was suggested that this particular document and similar information be scanned for placement on website.

The chairman prompted PMiC for a recommendation as to how to implement such best practices, as each individual decides on his own, whereby De Waal replied that should the PMiC be given the necessary opportunity and when the appropriate envisaged networks have been established, it would become clear which institutions are better suited to assist with the management.

Coligny Stegmann remarked that the PMiC should be instructed to combine all the recommendations from PredSA, Niel Viljoen's project on monitor farms and any other sources of information to provide farmers with useful introduction to predator control and best practices. Otherwise documents will just lay and gather dust.

6.2 Formulation of PMF as legal entity (arising)

The chairman referred to the draft constitution which was drawn up by Willie Clack and the meeting took cognisance of the recommendations by the NWGA. SAMGA gave their approval with the constitution but WRSA is unable to take part in the conversation as Adri Kitshoff Botha did not brief Dale Cunningham on the matter.

Magdel Boshoff questioned the status of membership of DEA and it will be referred to their legal department to advise how a state department can be incorporated into a legal entity.

Willie Clack expressed disappointment with the process and he was tasked to compile a draft constitution within 15 days and only the NWGA responded with comments. No further progress can now be made as WRSA is not in a position to contribute to the discussion of establishing a legal entity.

<u>Decision</u>: (1) Anticipated decision to be postponed to the next meeting, which will necessitate a special meeting if combined with other meetings (no extra costs). This will be the last time that decision is postponed and concrete decision must be made at following meeting; (2) WRSA indicated that they will provide an answer by Friday, 9th of February; (3) As with DEA, DAFF also need to be approached to determine their association with a legal body; (4) Composition of the forum and voting rights of members – Willie Clack to look into the matter and circulate number of options; (5) Either date of 25 April was suggested (alongside Agri SA Commodity Chamber) or during August meeting; (6) As Magdel Boshoff is not available on 25 April, DEA's provisions and suggestions to be circulated to the meeting; and (7) As the 4 industries are implied with legal status, this matter to only be discussed by Steering committee and not AGM.

6.3 Norms & Standards

Magdel Boshoff reported that the DCA N&S is unfortunately not ready for implementation yet due to the prioritisation of other Departmental processes. The N&S will be finalised and submitted to working group meetings in April for approval to implement. As the scientific assessment should be concluded at the end of March, resulting in recommendations to policy makers, it is the suggestion of Ms Boshoff to possibly include this in the N&S.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

Magdel Boshoff referred to comments at the August 2017 PMF meeting where Daan Bodenstein referred to the unpractical implications of assessment of DEA officials at the scene of predation losses. As the public participation process has concluded, Magdel undertook to relook at the clause in the N&S and consider using the words "to the extent where it is practicable and possible", thereby creating flexibility to the practice.

6.4 Poison getters (arising)

Leon de Beer referred to a telephonic conversation with Johan Strydom, whereby he requested a letter of support from PMF in his endeavour to manufacture triggers. Letter to contain specific information relating to the extent of losses and the acknowledgement that the Silent Solution will contribute to deterring losses.

In order for the Dept. of Health to consider requests as stipulated in letter dated 9 October 2017, Magdel Boshoff suggested that a formal request be directed to DEA to assist with the process; make the necessary contact and brief and update the DG of Health on the submission.

On a question by Coligny Stegmann if a principle decision by PMF has been taken on where the responsibility lies with regards to the control of getters, Leon de Beer replied: (1) PMF can only support the process; (2) Create a legal framework for submission to DEA in order to use getters in the toolbox of control methods; and (3) Any individual such as Johan Strydom is allowed to operate within the framework.

Decision: (1) Letter of support to be drafted and sent to Johan Strydom; and (2) Formal request to DEA to assist with the submission to Dept. of Health.

6.5 National strategy – predators escaping protected areas

(Potential threat of protected areas on livestock farms (arising)

Due to budgets that have been cut for the current financial year, the DEA are unable to apply for funding for projected project that will look into the national strategy for predation management. To possibly focus on other directorates and apply for funding in the new financial year.

As the PMiC do not have the capacity, they would be able to perform the function by sourcing additional skills and expertise should finances be obtained.

6.6 Stray dogs

Willie Clack briefly reported on efforts of SALGA to facilitate meetings with municipalities in Gauteng and EC to see how stray animals can be managed through the implementation of bylaws and cooperation between stakeholders.

6.7 Predation Management manual

6.7.1 Xhosa translation

Bonita Francis briefly reported on the Xhosa translation of 2 page document from Predation Management Manual that will be made available to communal farmers.

6.8 Predator fencing support

Chairman briefly reported on efforts by PMF to determine the need for fencing support countrywide. Telephonic enquires totalling 180 km of fencing were channelled for quotations.

6.9 Leopard problem in the EC

The meeting took note that the EC NWGA, SAMGA, Nature conservation and DEA was informed to put a system in place whereby permits which are not issued, are recorded in order to monitor and build a paper trail to report to relevant authorities.

Version 5.0 - HD de Waal - Version 5.0

6.10 Predator training programme

6.10.1 Certificates for instructors

Leon de Beer enquired who the issuing authority should be that would provide certificate to person to function as an accredited instructor (not issuing permits) thereby enabling person to conduct training on behalf of DEA.

Dale Cunningham used the example of professional hunters in the game industry whereby permits are issued by DEA, thereby necessitating that course content is also approved by DEA. He referred to number of professional hunting training facilities in SA, of which the EC have 3, and that the course content are all the same and that certificates are issued the service providers. Process to run on a similar basis.

Magdel Boshoff spotted a slight complication in that the professional hunting industry is regulated versus no legislation from DEA regulating the provision of training, i.e. a permit to train other people is not a requirement and how does DEA enforce it without legislation. (The method is regulated, but who to provide training is not regulated).

During workshop last year held with provincial authorities, it was agreed upon that Viljoen's training will be used as baseline/standard, i.e. that provinces regard it as adequate to issue permit to person to apply control methods.

Leon de Beer accentuated the fact that Viljoen's standard of training is regarded better than the standard required by SETA.

<u>Decision</u>: (1) <u>Issuing of certificate ("Nagskieters")</u> Magdel Boshoff remarked that DEA will require Niel Viljoen, who performed the training, to issue the certificate of competence. As DEA also regard Niel's training as the accepted standard for training, they can confidently issue a person with a permit to apply certain control methods, as they have been adequately trained; (2) <u>Training of instructors</u> Magdel Boshoff to set up an urgent meeting with provincial authorities to discuss the issue of training of other people/instructors (2.1) To agree on procedure (as there are no legislation) of training (2.2) On the suggestion that the person with the highest competency level in the department attend the proposed meeting, the suggestion of Magdel was accepted: (2.2.1) Technical officials are the right representatives to attend meeting; (2.2.2) Recommendations of above meeting to be referred to Working Group 1 (Directors) and MINTEC (HOD's). Outcome to be based as a procedure for implementation in N&S; and (2.2.3) DEA to take note of most effective methods of predator control for inclusion in N&S – do not want the procedure to drag. (2) <u>Methods</u>: (2.1) "Roep en Skiet"- most popular and most used method; (2.2) "Vangysters" – foothold traps; (2.3) "Vanghokke" – cage traps; (2.4) Limited application for dog hunting; and 2.5) Getters. (3) <u>Course content</u>: Course content as endorsed by DEA to be placed on the PMF website, with a notice saying "awaiting final approval from DEA".

6.10.2 Standards for training

According to Leon de Beer, the standard of training of Niel Viljoen is sufficient to qualify a professional hunter to hunt on a farm and be compensated for it. Such a person to receive permit to hunt from DEA.

He used the example of a wool classing course being conducted by agricultural colleges who is accredited to provide the training – normal wool classer qualification. Should a wool classer want to be trained as a Springbok head classer, he is trained by Springbok head instructors, who have been identified by the NWGA, who will make recommendations to a committee who will approve the qualification.

Have started in the Eastern Cape where Niel Viljoen is training people according to standards acceptable to EC Nature conservation, thereby qualifying and issuing permits to person to hunt on farms.

6.10.3 Poison getter training

Version 5.0 - Final Version 5.0

6.10.3.1 Accreditation and instructors

Leon de Beer enquired whether Johan Strydom, who has a permit for poison and have the knowledge and expertise, should be the designated person to do getter training. Strydom conveyed certain ideas whereby people will be set up in clusters around the country and manage poison.

Coligny Stegmann cautioned the random ideas of poison management and reiterated the fact that it is actually a state function, whereby Leon de Beer replied that it should remain a state function, therefore the letter to the DG of Dept. Health enquiring about the possibility of importing sodium cyanide by the Dept. of Health and if so, how the post-import use of such poison (i.e. a getter) would be regulated.

Dale Cunningham is of the opinion that DEA cannot be expected to regulate the use of poison and that procedure for the game industry, the utilisation of veterinary environment with the use of proper registers, could be considered.

Magdel Boshoff referred to the gap between the departments of environment and health whereby the Dept. Health administers the act and has certain rules and regulations in place. DEA is struggling to make contact with them to discuss the matter to see how they can be incorporated into the system.

<u>Decision</u>: As Johan Strydom is probably the only person with the necessary knowledge, skill and permit for poison, to invite him to the August meeting and listen to his plans on training etc.

6.11 Baboon Damage Interest Group

Support was pledged for membership to the Baboon Damage Interest Group (BDIG). The names of Douglas Calldo and Thys Delport, both in the WC, have been considered to send to scheduled workshop.

<u>Decision</u>: WRSA to give indication of separate representation.

6.12 PredSA

The meeting took cognisance of progress reports as contained in the agenda. Both Leon de Beer and Coligny Stegmann is part of the process custodian group (PCG).

Refer to detail previously listed in the minutes under paragraph 6.1.1. Prof. HO de Waal alluded to the process where some assistance offered by a group of colleagues (and specific comments) was ignored in the process of drafting the chapter on socio-economic impact. The following detailed text was provided on 26 February 2018 at the request of the PMF Secretariat:

"The concerns raised regarding the comprehensive and authoritative scientific assessment remain the following:

- *Literature cited in the chapter on "The Socio-economic impacts …" is lacking important relevant references to published articles and archived official documents; this is the biggest flaw in the initiative to create a balanced assessment.*
- *Casual perusal of some other chapters has provided similar results regarding references to important published articles and archived official documents; two exceptions are chapters 6 and 7 where colleagues of mine have made a marked input.*
- *Indirect references are made to important aspects of predation and predation management by simply citing references without sourcing and citing the original publications.*
- *Predation is impacting negatively on livestock farms (sheep, goats and cattle) and wildlife ranches, but the extent is not adequately substantiated in the chapter.*
- *At an early stage and until the process has been concluded, no information may be considered worthwhile or "grey" and therefore not included in the process.*

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

- *If relevant historical information (published articles and archived official documents) is ignored for whatever reason, it cannot be expected to present a credible scientific assessment.*
- *The document, the chapters as a whole, fails to establish a much needed institutional memory of predation management in South Africa."*

If these concerns are not addressed the credibility of the assessment may be jeopardised.

Leon de Beer commented that members of the PCG received a comprehensive list of comments received during the 30 day period to comment and that none of the above comments were captured. Any person could have also registered as a stakeholder to participate actively in the process. All of this is in line with international practice.

Decision: (1) As DEA is part of PCG and co-funder of the project, Magdel Boshoff proposed that the non-inclusion of scientific commentary in Chapter 3, be taken up with Prof. Kerley, thereby not putting anybody on the spot. She undertook to take the matter up with Prof. Kerley and to report back to PMF; and (2) Chairman requested Prof. de Waal to submit his concerns to DEA in writing and copy the PMF to ensure that the process is not criticized unfairly in the future.

6.13 PMF newsletter

The meeting gave permission to include links to view auctions of wool and red meat producers on the monthly PMF newsletter.

6.14 SKA

Willie Clack wanted to know the progress and if anything formal have been signed by SKA regarding their responsibility in predation control. The Chairman referred to the comments and recommendations directed to CSIR – Lydia Cape in March 2017.

Decision: (1) To follow up with CSIR if PMF recommendations have been included on objectives; and (2) CC Willie Clack in the correspondence.

7 RESEARCH

7.1 Cheaper fencing (arising Forum meeting)

The meeting discussed the number of attempts to enquire about appropriate material for fencing. To inform Koning Scholtz of the outcome that research is not really an option to consider cheaper fencing.

8 BUDGET

8.1 2017/18 Budget

8.1.1 Niel Viljoen study tour expenses

Taking into account the discussions and approval over the past 4 years of the necessity for Niel Viljoen to undertake the study tour, the Chairman felt it necessary to refer industries to the expenses amounting to R96 000. As only SAMGA undertook to pay 7% of budget, the NWGA is left to pay the balance. He requested that RPO and WRSA consider contributing towards this budget.

Decision: (1) SAMGA to be invoiced for 7%; and (2) WRSA and RPO to give indication of contribution.

8.1.1.1 Report

Coligny Stegmann referred to concluding remarks of report and emphasised the fact that the State be reminded of their responsibilities towards predation management. He referred to the PMiC, which should actually be a state funded function. PMF to continue to pursue government for funding and do the job ourselves.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

<u>Extract from Niel Viljoen report</u>: (1) Met al die miljoene dollars aan navorsing, navorsingsprojekte en navorsinginstansies, selfs die Staat wat betrokke is, is die VSA ook nog maar soekende….(2) Inteendeel was dit opmerklik die gebrek aan kennis van predatore onder die boere in die VSA. Dit is hoofsaaklik weens die feit dat die staat betrokke geraak het by die bestuur van predatore en die werk is so half en half uit die hande gevat van die boere.

Magdel Boshoff cautioned the statement that it is governments' responsibility, as they cannot be expected to executive the same functions as previous years, and can definitely not be compared to America to operate similar systems.

Willie Clack expressed optimism with the ability to source funding from government, but then one has to be in the right entity, with the right partners, right bank account and wright the necessary business proposals with the right implementing agents.

8.2 2018/19 Budget

Meeting took note of the budget proposals.

8.2.1 <u>PMF Ad hoc account</u>

Detailed ledger for period 1.07.2017 – 31.12.2017 as well as the latest bank statement for the account, was submitted to the meeting. Each year industries will be invoiced for contribution towards the account. On the proposal of Willie Clack and seconded by Coligny Stegmann, the bank account statements were approved."

At the meeting of 6 February 2018, Prof. HO de Waal reiterated previous requests for information on the demonstration/monitor farms, for example where the farms are located and the positive results obtained over the past 8-9 years. Such information should be edited and packed for specific audience groups and distributed as best practices for the training of farmers, farm workers and predator hunters, as well as information for the broad public and policy makers.

At the meeting of 6 February 2018 in Port Elizabeth, the PMF Steering Committee clearly articulated the often-expressed urgent need for the PMF to acquire its own legal status. This process was of particular importance for the RPO's representatives.

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMF Newsletter FEBRUARY 2018[1060]:

- **Predation management: SA livestock farmers ahead of those in America**
- Predation specialist Niël Viljoen holds the view that South African livestock farmers are ahead of their USA counterparts regarding their knowledge of predators and their behaviour.
- In September last year, Viljoen toured the USA to broaden his personal knowledge and passion for predators and specifically predation management. There he could compare his observations with circumstances in South Africa. According to Viljoen in the USA – a first world country spending much financial resources on the latest technology and research and with many research stations and strong government involvement – livestock farmers are still looking for the silver bullet, that single rapid solution for predation, which does not exist yet.
- In his view, the only aspect where South Africa could learn something from the USA is the type of equipment such as foothold traps and cage traps, which have been developed over many years to catch predators.
- The lack of knowledge of predators by the USA farmers was apparent and it may be deduced that the involvement of government in managing the problem took it out of the hands of farmers. Many younger farmers regard it as the responsibility of government to solve predation matters.

[1060] PMF Newsletter FEBRUARY 2018; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

- To train farmers, especially new entrants, regarding predators and their behaviour is of utmost importance to curb predation. In South Africa, the industries with a stake in livestock farming are themselves involved in the training. In contrast, contractors outside the industry provide the training in the USA. In Viljoen's humble view, this state of affairs increased the lack of knowledge among livestock farmers regarding predators, with catastrophic consequences for America.
- Predators must be seen and managed as a farming enterprise and requires the same level of knowledge regarding black-backed jackals and caracals as for cattle (Hereford, Angus), sheep (Dorper, Merino) or black wildebeest[1061]. Unfortunately, predators will never disappear from livestock farms. "*Manage this farming enterprise of your farm with the same knowledge, time and affection as the rest of your farming enterprises*," said Viljoen.
- Click here for full report.

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter FEBRUARY 2018[1062]:

*"**Predation centre enters its second year***

March will see the start of the second year of the functioning of the Predation Management Information Centre (PMiC), hosted by the University of the Free State (UFS). The annual report was presented at the most recent PMF Steering Committee meeting and the continuation of the contract will be negotiated depending on whether funding from the industries is available. The following progress was noted:

Communication with stakeholders

Over the past year, the PMiC has strengthened its ties with various stakeholder groups. The PMiC thanks everyone who made (and continues to make) contact, and encourages further communication from especially the livestock farming, wildlife ranching and predator control communities. Whether it is to request information, or to supply information on predation experienced, or predation management practised in your area, all information is welcomed.

Information management

Databases have been created and are continually being updated. The information contained in these data-bases includes the national and provincial:

- *contact details of the relevant authorities and permit offices;*
- *current legislation;*
- *contact details of predation management specialists and predator biologists;*
- *suppliers of predation management aids (guarding animals, devices and equipment); and*
- *PMF representatives.*

The PMiC has also expanded its collection (of over 5 500 copies) of published literature (popular, as well as scientific) on damage-causing animal species and the strategies employed locally, as well as internationally, in animal damage management.

Valuable information has been received from individual farmers and specialist predator hunters, which will allow us to create a better picture of the predation management situation prevailing in certain parts of South Africa. The continued supply of this kind of information is important to help interested parties identify areas where the threat of predation is the greatest, and also to see which methods of predation management are used with success in specific areas, so encouraging the use of such methods in similar areas.

Research

One of the projects currently under way within the PMiC is the collection and review of all available information on past systems of coordinated predation management in

[1061] *Connochaetes gnou*
[1062] PMF Newsletter FEBRUARY 2018; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 – File de Wind – version 5.0

South Africa. A good deal of progress was made in the past, but several factors have prevented further progress. The most important of these is arguably the geopolitical shift that occurred in April 1994, resulting in large chunks of important institutional memory being lost. Our aim is to use the information collected to identify all the strengths and weaknesses of these past systems, so that coordinated predation management can pick up where it left off, and that renewed efforts focus on tried-and-tested methods that are practicable in today's situation. The project therefore also focuses on legislation that is currently effective across South Africa in managing damage-causing animals.

Another project that has been running over the past year is the processing of information on predation management received from various sources in the past, so that the results can be disseminated to interest groups in the near future.

A research aid in the form of a mobile application is being developed to make the process of collecting predation management information easier and less time-consuming. The application is ready for field testing and then wider application.

Coordination

To achieve coordinated predation management, there needs to be cooperation within and between the various stakeholder groups. The PMiC has made good progress in terms of establishing internal communication, as well as with the various government departments and some other individual stakeholders. We continue to strive towards improving communication and cooperation between all stakeholders.

The PMiC has also started affiliating with international bodies specialising in human–wildlife conflict mitigation, to learn from the best where predation management is concerned (in other words, countries where mitigation strategies have been a priority, and where they have been practised and developed over a very long time)."

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter FEBRUARY 2018[1063]:

*"**Progress of DCA norms and standards***

At the most recent meeting of the PMF Steering Committee, the Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA) representative Magdel Boshoff reported that the proposed norms and standards for damage-causing animals (DCA) were unfortunately not yet ready for implementation due to other departmental processes being prioritised.

The norms and standards will be finalised and submitted to working group meetings in April for approval to implement. As the scientific assessment should be concluded at the end of March, resulting in recommendations to policymakers, Boshoff suggested that their findings could perhaps be included in the norms and standards."

Prof. HO de Waal was invited to give a presentation[1064] on the impact of predation and predation management on 20 March 2018 to the Namaqualand Damage Causing Animal Forum at the Goegap Nature Reserve, Springbok, Northern Cape Province. This farming community covers a large tract of land in the arid northwest South Africa, bordering to the north on Namibia, runs along the west coast of South Africa and borders to the south with the Western Cape Province, and experienced considerable predation losses by leopards.

In response to the invitation for public participation published in the Government Gazette dated 16 March 2018, the PMF Secretariat provided input to the Director-General Department of Environmental Affairs. In a letter, dated 28 March 2018 the members of the PMF were informed regarding the input as quoted below:

[1063] PMF Newsletter FEBRUARY 2018; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

[1064] De Waal, HO, 2016. The impact of predation and predation management. Re Operation Phakisa: Agriculture, Land Reform and Rural Development. 20 March 2018. Goegap Nature Reserve, Springbok, Northern Cape Province.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

*"**INTEGRATED ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PLAN OF THE SQUARE KILOMETRE ARRAY (PHASE 1)***

The Notice which appears in the Government Gazette of 16 March 2018 bears reference.

Regarding the Notice of intention to adopt the Integrated Environmental Management Plan of the SKA (phase 1) as environmental management instrument and to exclude activities identified in terms of section 24(2)(a) or (b) of the Act from the requirement to obtain environmental authorization in terms of the Act, the Predation Management Forum (PMF) would like you to consider the following comments and recommendations:

The natural behaviour patterns and biology of predators present in this specific area is very important to understand. Therefore managing both fences and predators according to this is the key factor ensuring the success and outcome of the managing program.

The isolation (Jackal proof fence)

The best possible managing strategy to control predators is by means of a good method of isolation.

Constructing the fence

The construction of the isolation or jackal proof fence should consist of the following: (1) Corner and end poles should be at least 65mm in diameter; (2) Iron poles must be 1.85m; (3) Droppers must be 1.4m; (4) Bottom steel wire of fence must be 2.2mm; (5) Remaining steel wires must be 2mm; (6) Netting must be 1.2m (height) with 75mm gap openings and 1.8mm wire thickness; (7) Fence must be protected by both inner and outer anti crawlers; (8) Crawlers must be packed with stones; (9) All gates to the premises must have cement anti crawlers underneath gate; (10) Total height of fence must be 1.4m; and (11) Overhang of 500mm must be constructed on top of fence.

Managing & maintenance of the fence:

(1) Maintenance throughout the year is the key factor; (2) Construction of roads next to fences if possible, simplify managing; and (3) Concentrating on the following four times of the year looking specifically at managing strategies for caracal and Black back jackal: (a) Damage caused by natural elements: Rain, wind and snow. Inspection times: Directly afterwards; (b) February, March young jackals disperse all over nature. Inspection times: 3 times/week; (c) May, June jackals become very vocal trying to identify possible vacant territories to occupy. Inspection times: 3 times/week; and (d) Increasment in their movement with natural lambing season of small game and neighbouring livestock: Inspection times: Daily.

Managing program for predators

The correct managing program will be directly related to the progress made on the construction of the fence. Therefore the managing program will consist of two chapters: (1) Managing program while new isolation is under construction; and (2) Managing program when new isolation is completed and signed off.

Chapter one - <u>Managing program while new isolation is under construction</u>

Because of the state in which the fence is at this moment the following managing program will be of immediate effect as if the area was still run as a livestock farm: (1) Inspection, repairs and general maintenance of existing fence on a weekly base; (2) The area must be visited on a two monthly base by an accredited call and shoot DCA hunter to evaluate the population density and the removal of the predators; (3) If any losses to neighboring farms is reported and the possibility exist that predators are operating from inside the protected (SKA) area, immediate evaluation and removal of unwanted predators by an accredited DCA hunter must be done; and (4) Annual removal (March/April) of unwanted predators by means of a real hunt (helicopter).

Chapter two - <u>Managing program when new isolation is completed inspected and signed off.</u>

Version 5.0 - PROOF Work Version 5.0

(1) Yearly aerial census by helicopter on small game and predators determine numbers and population density (July); (2) Inspection, repairs and general maintenance of new fence on a weekly base; (3) Removal of all antelope species (Springbuck, Blesbuck ext.) which could damage new fence; (4) Yearly control of predators by means of accredited DCA hunter (August, September); (5) Yearly control of predators by means of aerial hunt. (March); and (6) Immediate control of predators by DCA accredited hunter once neighboring farm report and identify cause of losses is from predators operating from SKA.

Cost of constructing and maintenance fees

(1) Constructing fees will be the cost of SKA determent to specific dimensions; (2) Maintenance of fences will be shared with direct neighbors; (3) The PMF preferred a system of SKA rather paying an amount, agreed on per annum, to each direct neighbor which will be then responsible for the maintenance; and (4) Cost to specific control methods in the area will be for the SKA account and is available on request.

Re-evaluation of managing program

Running time for the proposed predator managing program will be three years after the final completion of the suggested jackal proof fence. After the three year period the managing program could be reconsidered and changes could be made by a predator specialist depending on: (1) General state of managing and maintenance ability of the jackal proof fence by both parties; (2) The outcome of the aerial count for predators; (3) The outcome of aerial count for small game; (4) Evaluation of the stomach contains of predators removed; and (5) Input from neighboring livestock farmers on progress of SKA predator managing program.

All personal and staff participating in this managing program must be properly trained and qualified before considerate as participants."

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter MARCH 2018[1065]:

*"**PMF engaging with SKA project***

The Predation Management Forum (PMF) recently made recommendations on the Square Kilometre Array (SKA) project, which is situated near Carnarvon in the Karoo. It registered as an affected party at Digby Wells Environmental, a company providing environmental and social services, and used the opportunity to comment on certain aspects of the project.

Digby Wells Environmental provided information on the heritage resources management (HRM) process undertaken for the SKA project of the South African Radio Astronomy Observatory (SARAO).

The PMF informed the SKA community that it was very important to understand the natural behaviour patterns and biology of predators present in this specific area. Managing both fences and predators are key factors in ensuring the success and outcome of the management programme. The best possible management strategy for controlling predators is by using a good method of isolation (i.e. appropriate fencing).

Recommendations were made on the construction, management and maintenance of fences, as part of a predator management programme consisting of two distinct periods, namely:

1 a management programme for isolating the area with new fences; and

2 a management programme when the new fences have been completed and signed off.

Regarding the cost of construction and maintenance fees, the PMF recommended that the SKA project should pay the cost of constructing the fences; that the maintenance

[1065] PMF Newsletter MARCH 2018; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - Hoede Waak - Version 5.0

of boundary fences should be shared with direct neighbours and that the SKA project should pay an agreed amount annually to each direct neighbour, who will in return be responsible for maintaining the fences. As a prerequisite, all personnel and staff participating in this management programme should be properly skilled and qualified.

IEMP for the SKA project – call for public participation

The Minister of Environmental Affairs has given notice that the Integrated Environmental Management Plan (IEMP) for the SKA (Phase 1) be adopted.

Members of the public are invited to submit comments to the Minister by 16 April 2018. Telephone enquiries can be directed to A. Mocheko on 012 399 9315 and comments submitted to amocheko@environment.gov.za."

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMF Newsletter MARCH 2018[1066]:

- **Brown hyaena – do not kill**
- Predation specialist, Dr. Gerhard Verdoorn wrote the brown hyaena, also known as the 'strandwolf' or 'strand jut' (wolf) or simply brown wolf, is a unique animal widely distributed in South Africa, although it does not occur in large numbers. They are related to the spotted hyaena, as well as the striped hyaena[1067] (which occur in northern Africa and the Middle East), but their behaviour differ considerable from these two related species.
- The brown hyaena is definitely not a wolf. Some scientists group them, together with the other hyaenas, closer to mongooses than to real dogs that belong to the *Canis* genus.
- Nevertheless, they are in all respects predators with very strong jaws and huge teeth, which give them the ability to crush large bones, but also to hunt and kill if need be.
- There are very few predation cases involving brown hyaenas, but for clarity some experience of a few cases over the past 30 years are shared.
- One of the first cases was in the late 1980s in the Magaliesberg when he and a friend Danie Terblanche monitored Cape vultures at Scheerpoort. "*We have regularly found tracks of brown hyaenas, as well as their scat and odour marks; I still believe that the Magaliesberg is one of the areas where they are still abundant*," said Dr. Verdoorn. "*One Sunday morning we followed the tracks of a brown hyaena and saw how he vomited over a distance of two kilometre pieces of a sheep lamb. The estimated weight of the lamb was more than 15 kg. Whether the brown hyaena killed the lamb it will never be known for certain but it might have been the case*."
- A very recent case was in February this year near Humansdorp in the Eastern Cape. Early one morning a sheep farmer found four dead lambs close to one another and a fifth whose face was eaten away.
- "*I indicated it was the work of a brown hyaena, maybe a young male, and requested the farmer to search more in the camp. They found four more lambs, all with the same bite marks at the back of the skulls. Definitely a brown hyaena!*"
- The best indicator with small livestock are two teeth holes at the back of the skull or on the neck, as well as the number of animals killed. If it is small lambs less than 15 kg, the brown hyaena will often devour one completely leaving only the head and front feet. If the predation occur again, it is usually the work of old males, while females with cubs will sometime kill one or two animals and devour most of the carcases. The males remain the main culprits.
- What should be done in such a situation? Brown hyaenas seldom kill livestock and very seldom wildlife, because they are more a scavenging type of animal than spotted hyaenas. Yet, when they do cause damage, one should make a plan to catch it in a strong cage trap and relocate it at a reserve. Indeed a useful scavenger, eating bones and thus prevent botulism ('*lamsiekte*').

[1066] PMF Newsletter MARCH 2018; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[1067] *Hyaena hyaena*

Version 5.0 - Nowhat - Version 5.0

- The best bait is dead chickens or the meat of carcasses of animal killed by the hyaena. When the animal is caught (which usually happens quickly), cover the cage trap with a tarpaulin to keep the hyaena cool and contact the nature conservation authorities to help move and relocate it. It is known that females can wander over vast distances; a female was marked in the Magaliesberg and six weeks later located near Port Nolloth! Quite an achievement.
- "*I think there is not a single farm in South Africa where a brown hyaena has not yet left its mark, but the occurrence of predation is so little that it baffles farmers when it does happen. Do not try and kill it, please contact for advice and assistance to catch and relocate the animal.*"
- Contact Dr. Gerhard Verdoorn at 082 446 8946 or nesher@tiscali.co.za

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter MARCH 2018[1068]:

> *"**Contact PMiC for assistance in predator control***
>
> *The Predation Management Information Centre (PMiC) is your one-stop centre for all enquiries relating to predator control. You will be able to access contact details of national and provincial authorities, permit offices and predation management specialists. The PMiC is in the process of sourcing national and provincial policies and regulations on damage-causing animals. A telephone help desk will record and navigate your specific enquiry to provide immediate assistance.*
>
> *Contact Quinette Kruger at 051 401 2210 or via email at PredationMC@ufs.ac.za or click on the link https://www.ufs.ac.za/natagri/departments-and-divisions/animal-wildlife-and-grassland-sciences-home/animal-and-wildlife-and-grassland-sciences/alpru-home/products-and-services to visit the website."*

In response to the invitation for public participation published in the Government Gazette dated 16 March 2018, Prof. HO de Waal also provided input on behalf of ALPRU regarding the *Final IEMP May 2017* (416-page document) to the Director-General Department of Environmental Affairs on 12 April 2018; as quoted below:

> *"**INTEGRATED ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR THE SOUTH AFRICAN MID-FREQUENCY ARRAY OF SKA PHASE 1***
>
> *We are in general agreement with the proposed adoption of the IEMP and the conditions outlined in the notice dated 16 March 2018.*
>
> *We are also concurring with the broad comments and input provided by the Predation Management Forum (PMF; letters dated 17 March 2017 and 28 March 2018).*
>
> *It is recommended by ALPRU that the following editorial comments and input be considered.*
>
> *1. As stated previously (ALPRU's input; 17 March 2017), the development of the SKA Project will have unintended consequences for a traditional farming community. The SKA Project (which is already partly implemented) is being established on a large tract of rural South African landscape; in an area still predominantly engaged in traditional sheep farming.*
>
> *2. The SKA Project must engage the farming community with the necessary sensitivity in the short to longer term. The potential for an escalation in human-wildlife conflict must have been pre-empted and, therefore, have been managed from a much earlier stage in the initiation of the development.*
>
> *3. It is essential to establish and foster good neighbourly relations between the NRF/SKA property and neighbouring farms. It is widely perceived that the SKA Project is the "invader" in a traditional sheep farming community, therefore having good neighbourly relations should have been a very high priority because the expected lifetime of the SKA Project is about 50 years.*

[1068] PMF Newsletter MARCH 2018; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 – HO de Waal – Version 5.0

4. Given the vast area claimed by the NRF/SKA property and the large number of neighbouring farms, a joint committee is needed to enable effective liaison and coordination, specifically to manage predation and address other issues of common interest to both groups of neighbours.

5. This advice seems to have been accommodated. However, it may already be a case of too little left too late in addressing major farmer and community concerns. If left unattended or addressed too late during further implementation of NRF/SKA operations, the lack of important aspects of social cohesion will definitely lead to unintended but escalating social conflict.

6. Good perimeter fences are the first lines of defence for livestock farmers to mitigate the impact of predation (black-backed jackals and caracal). Appropriate fences are to be erected and maintained as a high priority on the perimeter of the NRF/SKA property and adjacent farmland.

7. Special attention is drawn to the construction or upgrading of access roads traversing private land and giving access to dish antennas in the spiral arms; these gates and cattle grids in the perimeter fences must also be predator-proof (Chapter 2, section 10, p 72).

8. The Fencing Act [Act 31 of 1963], as emended, is applicable to all relevant citations in the text; it provides a definition for a "jackal-proof fence" without providing specifications. Therefore, "Section 7 Notice in respect of erection of a boundary fence" is of particular interest. The First Schedule: Notice of Intention to Fence (First Schedule amended by s. 3 of Act 3 of 1971) provides a set format for specific arrangements between landowners.

9. However, it should be noted that the perimeter fences and associated predation management activities must comply with specific restrictions posed by SKA RF policy, namely, "(limited electric equipment may be employed e.g. no electric fencing, limited monitoring cameras and minimal human presence on site)" (Chapter 5, section VII, p 34).

10. The specifications for a so-called "jackal-proof fence" (as provided in detail by the PMF) should be considered a "predator-proof fence" because it must also be able to effectively prevent caracal from migrating to farms.

11. Drouilly et al. (2017) concluded that farmers must protect their livestock from predators, even when wild prey are abundant because black-backed jackals prefer sheep and goats over similar sized wild mammals. It was further concluded that it is still likely that protected areas provide sources of dispersing predators to recolonize territories rendered vacant on farmland by culling efforts.

Drouilly, Marine, Nattrass, Nicoli & O'Riain, M.J., 2017. Dietary niche relationships among predators on farmland and a protected area. The Journal of Wildlife Management; DOI: 10.1002/jwmg.21407.

12. As the envisaged area of NRF/SKA operations increases (Chapter 5, section 1, p 1), the existing perimeter fences must be upgraded as a high priority to comply with the minimum specifications to prevent predators from migrating to neighbouring farms.

13. The perimeter fences must be accessible for vehicles and inspected regularly to detect and repair any defects (burrowing animals such as aardvark or warthog and possible damage by rainwater along waterways).

14. Predators will prey on indigenous available fauna on the NRF/SKA property, but inevitably, they will try to cross the fences and predate on neighbouring livestock (Drouilly et al., 2017). As alluded to previously (ALPRU's input; 17 March 2017), predating activities will reach peaks during the annual whelping of the black-backed jackals (July-October) and it coincides with lambing seasons. Young black-backed jackals will start dispersing early in the year (February/March) and put pressure on the

Version 5.0 MD de Waal Version 5.0

quality and sturdiness of perimeter fences to exclude predators from farms. Caracal breed almost all year round.

15. It is advised that "leg-hold traps" be changed to read, "foothold traps" (Chapter 5, section 3, p 39 and elsewhere in text).

16. Despite all best efforts to prevent predators from migrating to neighbouring farms with predator-proof perimeter fences, the predator population size on the NRF/SKA property will still have to be managed. The services of specialist predator hunters (call-and-shoot, foothold traps and cage traps) will be needed to control predators on the vast NRF/SKA property; despite this input, predation management will also have to continue on livestock farms.

17. Every effort should be made to ensure that all information regarding coordinated predation management activities on the vast NRF/SKA property, as well as neighbouring private properties are logged, analysed and used to improve best predation management practices.

18. However, given the frequent statement "Poaching/hunting/intentional killing of any animal is not tolerated under any circumstances" [Chapter 4], it may be very difficult to reconcile this with the concept of coordinated predation management, which include control (that is <u>hunting</u> or <u>intentional killing</u>) of predators, on the NRF/SKA property.

19. Frequent references are made in the text to "Ensure that the Predator Control and Monitoring programme is implemented as part of the Land Management plan" [Chapter 4, pp 12, 15, 61 & 125]; but without providing specific detail on this important aspect of predation management or when it will happen. This may be intentional, as suggested below.

20. It is intended to declare the SKA core area as a Protected Area in terms of the National Environmental Management (NEM): Protected Areas Act (Act No 57 of 2003) [Chapter 1, p 10; and referred to frequently in Chapters 2 to 5]. Furthermore, "A Land Management Authority will be appointed by the National Research Foundation to manage the Protected Area and implement the Land Management Plan in the SKA telescope core in compliance with the requirements of the NEM: Protected Areas Act. The Land Management Authority will ensure that environmental protection activities and sustainable development guiding principles are incorporated in daily tasks on site; long term implementation of an Alien Invasive Control and Monitoring Plan and the implementation of a predator management plan."

21. The absence of providing important detail on the "Predator Control and Monitoring programme" which will form part of the envisaged "Land Management plan" may have been intentional and in anticipation of the objective to declare the SKA core area as a Protected Area?

22. A process has been started to engage with stakeholders (Workshops arranged for 24, 25 and 26 April 2018 in Williston, Brandvlei and Carnarvon respectively) to develop the SARAO National Park Management Plan during the 2018/19 financial year [SARAO; South African Radio Astronomy Observatory]. Once established, the SARAO National Park will be managed by SANParks.

23. Therefore, it seems inevitable that the perimeter fences of the envisaged SARAO National Park will have to comply with the SANParks Policy and relevant specifications; such perimeter fences will differ substantially, yet comply with what has been requested by the farming community.

24. Be it as it may, real or perceived concerns of the local, predominantly sheep farming community regarding predation and related matters must be addressed in partnership with the affected farmer groups as a matter of very high priority.

25. The reference for Bergman et al. (2013), as provided in footnote[38] [Chapter 5, section 2, p 35], is incomplete. It should read:

Version 5.0 – To be Wade Version 5.0

Bergman, D.L., De Waal, H.O., Avenant, N.L., Bodenchuk, M.J., Marlow, M.C. & Dale, D.L., 2013. The need to address black-backed jackal and caracal predation in South Africa. Proceedings 15th Wildlife Damage Management Conference, 25-28 March 2013, Clemson, South Carolina (J.B. Armstrong, G.R. Gallagher, Eds.).

26. A recent study is cited without the reference being provided in a footnote, namely Du Plessis et al. (2015) [Chapter 5, section 2, p 37]; for completeness two references are relevant for this study and should be provided as footnotes, namely:

Du Plessis, J., 2013. Towards the development of a sustainable management strategy for Canis mesomelas and Caracal caracal on rangeland. Ph.D. thesis. University of the Free State, Bloemfontein, South Africa.

Du Plessis, J.J., Avenant, N.L. & De Waal, H.O., 2015. Quality and quantity of the scientific information available on black-backed jackals and caracals: contributing to human-predator conflict management? African Journal of Wildlife Research 45(2): 138-157.

27. The following three references [Chapter 5, section 5, p 45] should also be cited in footnotes:

Badenhorst, C.G., 2014. The cost of large stock predation in the North West Province. M.Sc. Agric. dissertation. University of the Free State, Bloemfontein, South Africa.

Schepers, Anche, 2016. The economic impact of predation in the wildlife ranching industry in Limpopo, South Africa. M.Sc. Agric. dissertation. University of the Free State, Bloemfontein, South Africa.

Van Niekerk, H.N., 2010. The cost of predation on small-livestock in South Africa by medium-sized predators. M.Sc. Agric. dissertation. University of the Free State, Bloemfontein, South Africa.

28. In conclusion, it is suggested that all citations in the text are double checked before publishing the final version of the IEMP."

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter APRIL 2018[1069]:

*"**Approved competency qualification for predator training***

In the June 2017 PMF newsletter, the secretariat shared a news snippet that a memo was being circulated by the Eastern Cape office of the Predation Management Forum (PMF) regarding Seta accreditation. It informed all concerned that professional predation managers (PPMs) must be in possession of a Seta accredited certificate, issued by an approved training institution to prove their competency in predator calling and management strategies (https://www.pmfsa.co.za/images/news/PMF_Junie2017.pdf).

Leon de Beer, CEO of the National Wool Growers' Association of South Africa (NWGA), provides a detailed explanation and background to the necessity of establishing an approved qualification and accreditation system.

"The PMF has taken the initiative to develop a framework of minimum standards in the training of livestock producers and farmworkers on principles of ethical and best practices in predation management. This is implemented within the framework provided by the Sector Education and Training Authority for Agriculture (Agriseta).

"The NWGA, as a member of the PMF, is an accredited service provider with Agriseta and a qualified predation management specialist organisation providing training to producers within this framework under NWGA accreditation, who subsequently oversees quality standards of training."

Read more on the PMF website: https://bit.ly/2GLk2g1"

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMF Newsletter APRIL 2018[1070]:

[1069] PMF Newsletter APRIL 2018; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[1070] PMF Newsletter APRIL 2018; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

- **Predation management manual – available free of charge**
- The PMF secretariat receives inquiries about the purchasing of the predation management manual. Please note the manual (in Afrikaans and English) is available free of charge on the PMF website: https://www.pmfsa.co.za/home/knowledge-libra-ry/code-of-best-practice.
- The Best Practices for Predation Management in South Africa, compiled by Dr. Gerhard Verdoorn, predation specialist, is also on the website and may be downloaded.
- To order a hard copy, contact Bonita Francis, PMF secretariat at 041 365 5030 or nwga@nwga.co.za. Publications are also available at provincial NWGA and RPO offices.

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMF Newsletter APRIL 2018[1071]:

- **PMF present at SKA public workshops**
- SANParks and the SA Radio Astronomical Observatory (Sarao) is in the process of developing the Sarao National Park Management Plan during their 2018/19 financial year.
- The first step in the process is to discuss and determine with stakeholders the strategic direction the park would follow in the next 10 years.
- Workshops to discuss the "ideal condition" of the park are planned for 24 to 26 April in Williston, Brandvlei and Carnarvon.
- Niël Viljoen, predation specialist will represent the PMF.
- The Predation Management Information Centre (PMiC) was also registered as a stakeholder.

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMF Newsletter MAY 2018[1072]:

- **Poor attendance of SKA public workshops in the Northern Cape**
- SANParks and the South African Radio Astronomical Observatory (SARAO) are engaged in a process to develop the SARAO management plan for the 2018/19 financial year. The first step is to discuss and determine the strategic direction for the park in the next 10 years with stakeholders. Workshops to discuss and determine the "ideal circumstances" of the park will be held at the end of April in Williston, Brandvlei and Carnarvon. Both Niël Viljoen, predation specialist, and Herman Hugo, national chairman of the NWGA, registered as stakeholders parties to attend in Carnarvon.
- Viljoen expressed disappointment about the poor attendance by farmers. Although farmers indicated beforehand the dates were not feasible, arrangements to continue with the workshops were nevertheless implemented. Because of the poor attendance, it was decided to reschedule the workshops to enable more farmers to buy into the development of the management plan.
- Viljoen informed attendees about the importance of isolation and management and that erection of fences is a critical aspect of management and control. Because of his comments, a border farmer meeting was envisaged to attend specifically to the erection of fences.

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter MAY 2018[1073]:

"Baboon predation of sheep far more prevalent than anticipated

The Baboon Damage Interest Group (BDIG) met early May in Johannesburg. The attendance of Predation Management Forum (PMF) representative, Douglas Calldo, wool sheep farmer in the Laingsburg district, was welcomed.

Chairman of the BDIG, Dr John Scotcher, informed the PMF secretariat that Calldo was an active participant and that the problems he and other farmers were facing with

[1071] PMF Newsletter APRIL 2018; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[1072] PMF Newsletter MAY 2018; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[1073] PMF Newsletter MAY 2018; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - Home Ideal - Version 5.0

regards to predation by baboons, were graphically described. None of the attendees at the meeting was aware of the extent of the damage being done.

Besides the PMF, an extensive range of organisations took part in the deliberations on the management of damage-causing baboons, which included Baboon Matters, Mpumalanga Parks and Tourism, the Baboon Research Institute (UCT), Geasphere, International Truss Systems, Sanparks, Primate Care, Human Wildlife Solutions, the Nelson Mandela University, Forestry South Africa, DIY Wild, the Forest Stewardship Council and the Centre for Animal Rehabilitation and Education.

A code of good practice for the management of human-wildlife conflicts pertaining to the case of the chacma baboon, also known as the Cape baboon, was eminent from the meeting and has been circulated to all participants to amend appropriately according to experience and knowledge."

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMF Newsletter MAY 2018[1074]:

- **PMF meet with municipalities regarding vagrant dogs**
- The PMF is concerned about the huge livestock losses caused by vagrant dogs, especially near towns and urban area. Therefore, the PMF joined forces with the South African Local Government Association (SALGA) with its good communication structures with more than 250 local municipalities in the country.
- The General Manager of the NWGA, Leon de Beer on behalf of the PMF and accompanied by Collen Rammule, a policy analyst of SALGA, visited two municipalities. The latter assisted the PMF to organise visits to the Ndlambe municipality (Port Alfred) and the Steve Tshwete municipality (Middelburg, Mpumalanga). Representatives of among others the SAPS, traffic departments, the Animal Protection Associations, fire control authorities, municipal wildlife reserves and councillors attended the meetings.
- The meetings started with background information on the PMF and is envisaged initiative to cooperate with municipalities was discussed in depth.
- From the discussions, a few municipalities have been identified where good legislation was already in place. Both Ndlambe and Steve Tshwete municipalities agreed to liaise with successful municipalities and see to what extent existing legislation could be adapted (if necessary) to comply locally in practice.
- Possible strategies for implementing was discussed, including establishing cooperation structures between respective role players, liaison with relevant government departments such as Agriculture and Environmental Affairs, involvement of livestock producers, as well as community education regarding vagrant dogs.
- Follow-up meetings will be arranged within six months to monitor and report progress. The ultimate goal is to establish a framework for the control of vagrant dogs, which will be promoted via SALGA among all municipalities for implementation.

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter MAY 2018[1075]:

"PredSA scientific assessment concludes

Under the topic Maximise production at the forthcoming national congress of the National Woolgrowers' Association of South Africa in Port Elizabeth, Prof. Graham Kerley of the Nelson Mandela University will talk about the value of the PredSA scientific assessment for the producer.

The draft of the PredSA publication has been completed. The documents have been sent for technical design and layout, and will be finalised into a print-ready copy of the document that will undergo a final edit before being signed-off for printing and publishing.

[1074] PMF Newsletter MAY 2018; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[1075] PMF Newsletter MAY 2018; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - Not the Final Version 5.0

A closing conference to launch the PredSA publication is planned for the second quarter of 2018."

The annual congress of the National Wool Growers' Association was held from 13-14 June 2018 in Port Elizabeth. Prof. Graham Kerley (NMMU) announced the scientific assessment[1076] of livestock predation has been completed. It was only awaiting the signatures of both the minister of environmental affairs (DEA) and the minister of agriculture, forestry and fisheries (DAFF), before it can be printed and launched. Prof. Kerley was quoted in the PMF Newsletter of June 2018 as having highlighted some of the outcomes of the scientific assessment:

"1) This comprehensive assessment is a global first. When speaking to international agencies, we can now show that farmers can be proactively responsible by taking a scientific and robust approach to managing predators.

2) Economic impacts may be relatively small in terms of GDP, but high at the individual farmer scale, with impacts on the rural economy, employment and food security.

3) Commercial and communal livestock farmers face similar predation challenges.

4) There is no simple solution to managing livestock predation; therefore, there is no silver bullet solution.

5) Legislation and regulations need an overhaul. It is important to note that the book is policy-informative and not policy-prescriptive, and that members need to engage with policymakers.

6) An adaptive management approach is needed to improve the use of existing information.

7) A collaborative relationship between livestock managers, researchers and policymakers is key."

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter JUNE 2018[1077]:

*"**Scientific assessment of predation completed***

During the national congress of the National Wool Growers Association (NWGA), which ended on 14 June, Prof. Graham Kerley of the Nelson Mandela University (NMU) announced that the first scientific assessment for livestock predation and its management in South Africa has been completed. It is currently awaiting the signatures of both the minister of environmental affairs and the minister of agriculture, forestry and fisheries, before it can be printed and launched.

Kerley elaborated on the content of the assessment and highlighted some of the outcomes:

1) This comprehensive assessment is a global first. When speaking to international agencies, we can now show that farmers can be proactively responsible by taking a scientific and robust approach to managing predators.

2) Economic impacts may be relatively small in terms of GDP, but high at the individual farmer scale, with impacts on the rural economy, employment and food security.

3) Commercial and communal livestock farmers face similar predation challenges.

4) There is no simple solution to managing livestock predation, therefore there is no silver bullet solution.

5) Legislation and regulations need an overhaul. It is important to note that the book is policy-informative and not policy-prescriptive, and that members need to engage with policymakers.

6) An adaptive management approach is needed to improve the use of existing information.

[1076] Kerley, G.I.H., Wilson, S.L. & Balfour, D., 2018. Livestock predation and its management in South Africa: a scientific assessment (Eds.). Centre for African Conservation Ecology, Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University, Port Elizabeth.

[1077] PMF Newsletter JUNE 2018; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - HD de Waal - Version 5.0

7) A collaborative relationship between livestock managers, researchers and policymakers is key."

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMF Newsletter JUNE 2018[1078]:

- **Predation is an important matter for the NWGA**
- Last week at the annual congress of the National Wool Growers' Association (NWGA), Guillau du Toit highlighted predation in his chairman's report.
- The Lightstone report indicated that predation was one of the biggest bottlenecks for farmers. Therefore, the NWGA is engaged in an all-out effort to empower producers by means of training and joint actions.
- He cited the following bottleneck from Niël Viljoen's report regarding his recent tour to America: 'Predation is like a farming enterprise. Manage this enterprise of your farm with the same amount of knowledge and time – just as well as the rest of all your farming businesses. Your footprint on the ground makes the difference.'
- "*Therefore you understand why the NWGA management, in view of a budget under great pressure, give priority to projects which will benefit the producers directly. After a year of funding the Predation Management Information Centre (PMiC) the NWGA, as a role player in the PMF, does not see it fit to fund this centre in the coming year. Money spent in relation to value gained for the producers simply do not tally, thus this decision*[1079]", Du Toit said.
- Within the NWGA's producers' services provided the past year, eight predation management courses were presented and attended by 495 producers and farm workers. Niël Viljoen runs 27 monitor farms countrywide.

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMF Newsletter JUNE 2018[1080]:

- **SHARE YOUR MANAGEMENT PRACTICES WITH US!**[1081]
- Many farmers are managing predators effectively; therefore, such success stories should be shared with fellow farmers. Individual successful management practices will be published monthly in the PMF newsletter as well as posted on the website. Contact Bonita Francis at 041 365 5030 or nwga@nwga.co.za.

On 26 July 2018 Mr. Johan Strydom, a specialist predator hunter from Warden in the Free State Province visited Prof. HO de Waal in Bloemfontein. In a one-on-one session, lasting more than four hours, Mr. Johan Strydom conveyed some of the wealth of knowledge and skills on predation management accrued in a professional career of more than 44 years. He also provided detailed demonstrations of the development and use of the imported coyote getter. The coyote getters were imported from the USA since the early 1960s and widely used in South Africa. It has been replaced by the M-44 in the USA; the coyote getter fired a .38 Special cartridge case that contained NaCN toxicant, whereas a spring-driven plunger expels M-44 cyanide capsule contents.

Based on practical use and experience with the coyote getter, Mr. Johan Strydom made major improvements to the basic design and locally produced his version, the Fox Buster; in addition to the more durable design of the fox Buster, the NaCN toxicant was still expelled with a cartridge case, but it was much safer to use than the coyote getter.

Since the early 2000s, Mr. Johan Strydom started to develop a new design based on expelling the NaCN toxicant by the release of a spring-driven plunger; a design based on the same

[1078] PMF Newsletter JUNE 2018; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[1079] Editor's Note: As cited elsewhere, the impression was created in some circles that the PMiC did not meet its obligations in compliance with the four Service Agreements; it is simply not true, but a gross misrepresentation.
[1080] PMF Newsletter JUNE 2018; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[1081] Editor's Note: This request was posted in most subsequent PMF Newsletters and will not be cited again.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

principles as the M-44 but with greatly improved features and durability. Initially the working name of the new design was the "Silent Killer". The "Silent Solution" design has been patented and arrangements are underway to start its commercial production. Mr. Johan Strydom also briefly referred to the trial testing of the device during 2017 in the Eastern Cape under very poor weather conditions.

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter JULY 2018[1082]:

*"**Eastern Cape PMF concerned about leopards and stray dogs***

The biannual meeting of the Eastern Cape PMF took place during May. Neil du Preez is the new chairperson and special guests included Dr Nkabeng Maruping-Mzileni of the International Wildlife Fellowship Foundation (IWFF) and Leon Els of the Department of Economic Development, Environmental Affairs and Tourism (DEDEAT).

Most of the meeting concentrated around the issue of leopards and the problems associated with these animals between commercial agriculture and SANPARKS/EC Parks and private game reserves. Tracked leopards are leaving the protected areas and neighbouring landowners are not informed of their movements until they are discovered killing livestock. Presently there is only one service provider who is fully equipped to trap and relocate leopards, but his permit stipulations are not fully compliant at the moment. He can address this when he renews his permit application.

The relationship between farmers and the DEDEAT with regard to leopard control is not what it should be. Els proposed that he would assist with setting up a meeting between the chairman, du Preez, identified representatives of the farmers and the head of the Department, Albert Mfenyana, to discuss these problems. He furthermore indicated that there is a draft protocol in place and that he would forward the refined protocol to the Forum in due course. Els also indicated that until protocol is in place, no leopards can be sold or relocated to any other parks. They remain government property. Els made it clear that he was not part of the Forum but that he attended this meeting by invitation.

Another matter of concern was problems associated with dogs, which involves stray dogs as well as organised hunting utilising dogs. Rabies is of major concern and a significant percentage of the cattle population in the Eastern Cape is now being tested positive with the disease. The misuse of poison by landowners who are desperate to solve the dog issue is a concern to the Forum. This often results in off-label use of poisoning (with potential fines) as well as non-targeted animals being affected. Presently the municipal by-laws are not being applied to assist in the control of dogs.

Joggie Ackerman from DEDEAT is presently setting up a standard operating procedure (SOP) and members are asked to feed through information to assist with this process (joggie.ackerman@dedea.gov.za / 063 402 9055). Members were informed that government is re-establishing the defunct Poison Working Group to deal with all poisons. Lead poisoning is also becoming a matter of concern and people are asked to avoid using bullets containing lead.

The next meeting will be held in October in Queenstown and hopefully progress will be made in particular regarding the leopard issue, which has not been resolved since the original workshop set up in 2011. The Forum eagerly awaits Els's facilitatory role in this regard."

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter JULY 2018[1083]:

*"**Leopard project to assist authorities in decision-making***

[1082] PMF Newsletter JULY 2018; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[1083] PMF Newsletter JULY 2018; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

The Eastern Cape PMF invited a conservation ecologist to make a presentation at its recent meeting.

Dr Nkabeng Maruping-Mzileni, representing the International Wildlife Fellowship Foundation (IWFF), introduced her project proposal, entitled "Sustainability and economics of consumptive use of predators with the exception of the African lion by the foreign hunting market in South Africa". The rationale behind this is that there is increased conflict between leopards (in particular) and the human population, as well as a need for a consolidated and streamlined database. This would help identify priority areas where human and predator conflict is of concern, given the current encroachment and changes in habitat.

Furthermore, it will help with genetic and ecological sustainability of predator utilisation, as well as identifying feasible zones for the hunting of leopards based on ecological findings. Ultimately, this project will contribute to the norms and standards for the management and monitoring of leopard hunting for trophy-hunting purposes. This project is also aligned with the African Union Constitution (Article 14), as well as data requirements by the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES) for hunting quotas."

Representatives of the UFS requested to meet on 14 August 2018 with Mr. Guillau du Toit (Chairman PMF/NWGA) in Victoria West. Pursuant to the information about the NWGA's decision to discontinue its financial contribution to the PMiC at the UFS, the following document was prepared for discussion by representatives of the NWGA, RPO, SAMGA, WRSA and the UFS:

"Discussion document for the Predation Management Forum
[NWGA, RPO, SAMGA & WRSA]

Background

A meeting was held on 14 August 2018 @13h15 in Victoria West between Mr. Guillau du Toit (Chairman PMF/NWGA) and representatives of the University of the Free State (UFS), namely Prof. Danie Vermeulen (Dean: Faculty of Natural and Agricultural Sciences), Prof. Frikkie Neser (Head: Department of Animal, Wildlife and Grassland Sciences), Dr. Antonie Geyer (Programme Director: Agriculture) and Prof. HO de Waal (ALPRU/PMiC).

The urgent meeting with Mr. du Toit was scheduled at the request of the UFS.

Recently the NWGA decided to discontinue its financial contribution to the PMiC. According to Mr. du Toit, it was based on financial constraints and the prioritising of obligations.

The NWGA is a very important partner in the predation management forum (PMF). The objective of the roundtable meeting in Victoria West was to find common ground and ensure the NWGA's continued cooperation in the PMiC, in partnership with the UFS and co-producers' organisations, namely the RPO, SAMGA and WRSA.

It was mutually agreed that the NWGA should stay part of the predation management team and keep supporting the PMiC. The founding of the PMiC at the UFS in March 2017 provided impetus to fledgling activities, which was already operational. The objectives were refined and became more focused on supporting the NWGA, RPO, SAMGA and WRSA.

Financial considerations may adversely impact group coherence; therefore, it is important to review the financing model and ensure that the predation management team stays together.

Thus, it was necessary to draft a discussion document for consideration by representatives of the NWGA, RPO, SAMGA and WRSA on 5 September 2018; prior to the scheduled meeting of the PMF Steering Committee at the UFS.

National approach – a system of coordinated predation management (CPM)

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

Predation on livestock farms and wildlife ranches falls within the general ambit of agriculture, in close participation with relevant environmental and conservation authorities. However, the negative impact of predation cannot be addressed by the current fragmented approach and lack of a system of coordinated predation management (CPM).

Farmers and the government are equal partners in a system of CPM; each with specific responsibilities. The government is responsible for policy, coordination, extension, training, research, monitoring and effective communication, while the livestock farmers and wildlife ranchers are responsible for protecting their animals and controlling predators.

A system of CPM is based on institutional memory and a management information system (MIS) which is the common source of information, planning, leadership and guidance to inform predation management and prevent fragmented and uncoordinated actions. Ideally, the system of CPM should form part of official structures in the departments of agriculture (national and provincial) as well as good liaison and coordination with the national and provincial departments of environmental affairs.

Despite ongoing lobbying, the government ostensibly still lacks vision, capacity and expertise to handle the situation. However, given the negative impact of predation, South Africa cannot afford to continue treading water. Organs of state are seemingly unable to accept their responsibilities and functions. Therefore, the affected parties, namely the livestock farmers and wildlife ranchers through their producers' organisations as represented in the PMF, have to contribute financially to operate the PMiC and increase its capacity to provide a functional system of CPM.

Solutions for human-wildlife conflict are informed by institutional memory and an operational MIS. The PMiC provides this service and the system is constantly collecting, analysing, interpreting and distributing relevant information in South Africa.

In a system of CPM, an MIS must rapidly deliver appropriate answers to the following type of questions:

- *Where are predation losses occurring?*
- *Identify the current hotspots to redirect scarce resources.*
- *Which predator species are involved?*
- *What are the links between reported cases of predation and predation management?*
- *Does predation decline as a result of predation management on a property?*
- *What is achieved when different predation management methods are used?*
- *Who are the recognised and proven role players (e.g. specialist predator hunters)?*

Specialist predator hunters, as well as livestock farmers and wildlife ranchers are controlling predators. However, much of the important information alluded to above is not shared in a common information centre and is therefore not available to develop and improve best predation management practices. Small patches of such information exist, but the challenge for the PMiC is to break new ground and effectively develop and implement solutions for human-wildlife conflict.

Major progress has been made in developing two mobile telephone applications to report relevant information on livestock and wildlife predation losses and predation management activities. The two apps will enable the PMiC to source the information from a myriad of individuals namely livestock farmers, wildlife ranchers and specialist predator hunters. The information is integrated in GPS format to coordinate predation management activities and accelerate the response at different levels to mitigate the huge negative impact of predation.

The PMiC is actively collecting, maintaining and integrating information to create institutional memory and inform an MIS, consisting broadly of the following aspects:

- *Reported cases of predation losses (e.g. predator species, where, date and time).*

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

- *Reported cases of predation control (e.g. method used, species, sex, date and time).*
- *Non-lethal and lethal predation management methods and toolkits of equipment such as foothold traps and cage traps, livestock protection collars, bells and guard animals.*
- *Specifications and protocols regarding the correct way to obtain, safeguard, store and handle predation control devices and equipment.*
- *Hard and electronic copies of literature on predators, predation management and associated topics.*
- *Government departments, offices and staff involved with predation management.*
- *PMF, livestock and wildlife producers' organisations – staff involved with predation management.*
- *Universities and research institutions – specialists involved in predation management.*
- *Specific information on the fields of expertise of specialist predator hunters.*
- *National and provincial acts, regulations, policies and protocols applicable to predation management.*
- *Departmental offices and staff responsible to enforce regulations and issue permits regarding predation management.*

This information enables the PMiC to provide specialist services to stakeholders and role players to manage predation nationally on a coordinated basis. The following responsibilities have also been assumed:

- *Create/maintain an institutional memory/GIS/toolkits/library (hard copies & electronic)*
- *Disseminate relevant and appropriate information at various levels/audiences*
- *Provide appropriate equipment/methodologies to manage predation (non-lethal & lethal)*
- *Coordinate predation management activities (international/national/provincial/ district)*
- *Liaise (international/national/provincial/district)*
- *Monitor the situations following on predation management activities*
- *Facilitate training at various levels by the most appropriate trainers and methodologies*
- *Facilitate extension to a wide range of role players and stakeholders*
- *Identify and facilitate research and development projects*
- *Liaise with various role players and stakeholders*
- *Ensure that public relations are improved and maintained*
- *Assist in sourcing the necessary funding for priority research and development projects*

The Financial Model

The financial contributions of the NWGA, RPO, SAMGA and WRSA from 1 March 2017 to 28 February 2018 enabled the PMiC to make huge progress in realising its objectives. The fifth partner in the initiative is the UFS and it made a considerable financial as well as moral contribution towards the smooth implementation of the PMiC during the first formative year. Therefore, it would be a grave mistake to jeopardise the important initiative based on short term considerations.

Since 1 March 2018 no financial contributions have been received from the producers' organisations, although the RPO and SAMGA have indicated their continued financial commitment. In the absence of the funding from the producers' organisations since March 2018, the UFS stayed committed and continued its financial and moral support. This commitment to support the initiative was demonstrated by the representatives meeting with Mr. Du Toit at Victoria West.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

Originally, a proposal and budget for a projected period of 3 years was submitted to the PMF. The decision of the NWGA was taken after only one year of the projected implementation period of the PMiC. Therefore, it is proposed that the financial model be reviewed urgently by the PMF to fulfil the vision of most role players and create a system of coordinated predation management for South Africa as soon as possible."

On 22 August 2018, Prof. HO de Waal paid a curtesy visit to Mr. Jaco van Deventer at the CapeNature office in Porterville, Western Cape Province. It was the office of the late Mr. Hannes Stadler (Programme Manager: Wildlife Management, Biodiversity Support Services, CapeNature). The informal discussions with Mr. van Deventer started at 08h00 and lasted about an hour. Copies of important historical records on predation management were obtained on behalf of ALPRU. Items covered during the discussions included: a holistic, approach in predation management; the importance of general animal husbandry (livestock management); a rapid response to attend within 24 h to predation calls; cultivate trust with/between farmers and officials; cage traps for caracal and leopard; the overdue need for a 'second Ganzekraal'; Johan Strydom's input; PMF should find a 'winning recipe' for human-wildlife conflict; and nature (rain) > veld > fauna & flora > livestock/predation.

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter AUGUST 2018[1084]:

*"**This works for me… (a farmer's story)***

We are asking some farmers to share those practices that have proven to be successful under their farming conditions and circumstances. Last month, Swithan Webster who farms in Queenstown showed how netted fences have reduced his losses to jackal and lynx dramatically. This month we focus on Anatolian sheepdogs.

NO LOSSES, THANKS TO ANATOLIAN SHEEPDOGS

Dorothee Trollip of the farm Somerton in the Maclear district tells a heart-warming story of the success that they have with Anna and Jenny, their Anatolian sheepdogs.

As they farm near Maclear at the foot of the Drakensberg on 1 200 ha with arable lands, gently sloped grasslands, wetlands, a big river, rocky slopes and outcrops, and very close to forest plantations, this terrain is the ideal playground for jackal.

They run a relatively small flock of sheep (±350 breeding ewes) and for the past twenty years have been subjected to many losses to jackals all year round. Coming from a nature conservation background, the Trollips decided against lethal methods such as poison and gathered some information on guard dogs.

DETERMINED NOT TO USE LETHAL METHODS

Around twelve years ago, although they hadn't had any success to rehabilitate Boy, a "failed" Anatolian sheepdog from a sheep farmer outside Elliot, they were still determined to use this non-lethal method to keep problem animals away from their flock. Therefore they consulted the Cheetah Outreach in Middelburg and through them found a breeder and purchased Anna.

Anna's parents were working dogs and she was born among sheep and introduced to the Trollips when she was eight weeks old. They kept her in a small enclosure for months with five weaned lambs at the bottom of the farmyard. Her shelter was underneath the lambs' self-feeder and twice a day she was fed Montego Puppy with a bit of milk and initially with some calcium supplement. Within a day she bonded with the lambs and curled up next to them to sleep. Although they tried to keep their distance, Anna associated them with food and they eventually ended up cuddling with her. As Anna grew bigger, Dorothee tried to train her to follow some simple rules, like sit, stay and walk on a leash. She was very boisterous and had so much fun not following the commands, but rather running her over and jumping up to give love.

[1084] PMF Newsletter AUGUST 2018; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 – HO de Waal – Version 5.0

GUARD DOG NEVER KILLED OR INJURED ANY SHEEP

During the first two years they made sure that she was never separated from her little flock of five – they even loaded them up on the back of the van when she was taken to the vet to be sterilised. Once she was introduced to the bigger flock, the rest of the sheep initially ran away in all directions, but soon realised that she was no threat. Even though she would play quite roughly with them, and their neighbour's staff reckoned that she was killing sheep out in the camp, she eventually settled down by the time she turned two. She never killed or seriously wounded a single sheep.

The Trollips tried to introduce another Anatolian to the farm, but soon realised that the area was too small for another guard dog. Their territories overlapped, especially as they got older and roamed further. Besides that, the yard, house and all the sheep enclosures are in the centre of the farm.

THEY DO NOT GUARD SHEEP AGAINST OTHER DOGS

Anna goes out with the flock in the mornings and comes back with them late afternoon. They have to sleep in enclosures near the house, because of theft, roaming dogs and other predators. Anna was left with a flock out in the camp at night, but the sheep scattered and made it impossible for her to look after them, especially in the big camps with rough terrain. They were then put into makeshift enclosures in their camp for the night and Anna was put on a run wire within that enclosure. That's when they learnt that she doesn't guard the sheep against other dogs, because their neighbour's dogs got into the enclosure and caused a great deal of damage in her presence. The Trollips gave up on leaving the sheep out in the camp at night and brought them close to home in the evening. This is where they witnessed again and again that Anna keeps the jackals at bay and even kills them when they get too close to her flock.

She does not like cats and killed some favourite house and stable cats. She does not mind people, and one can easily treat her for ailments, dip, vaccinate and brush her. She barks a lot when strangers approach her flock, but doesn't attack, with the result that quite a few cases of theft were experienced, even though she was among the sheep. It was interesting to notice how the sheep become conditioned to her alarming bark; even when spread out in a camp grazing, they would all start running towards her.

JACKALS ARE ROAMING, BUT DO NOT ATTACK SHEEP

The result: the battle with stock theft continues, but the Trollips have a dog that guards the sheep without the danger of injuring or killing humans. It is quite possible that she has not been harmed or poisoned yet just because of that. However, stray dogs have become a problem, as she tolerates them among her flock. As Anna has killed all the yard cats there are plenty of rats in the yard. Although there is an abundance of jackal roaming around on the farm living off dassies, porcupines, etc., they do very little harm, because when Anna is around the sheep, she keeps the jackals away.

SEARCHING FOR A REPLACEMENT FOR ANNA

When Anna was close to ten years old, they started looking for a replacement. A lot had been learnt from Anna and the sheep were accustomed to having a dog among them.

In July 2016 the Trollips travelled to Jansenville to pick up their new Anatolian bitch from Jenny Heidenreich. The Heidenreichs had been breeding and selling trained dogs for many years, but left for greener pastures in Australia at the end of 2016. The new addition was named "Jenny" in honour of Jenny Heidenreich's amazing work with and for the Anatolians.

At the age of six months, Jenny was ready to work. She was kept in an enclosure for a week with some maiden ewes to get her to become used to the new environment, the shepherd and the Trollips. In the morning she went into the camps with a small flock of maiden ewes, while the main flock was lambing. She stayed with her flock right from the beginning and never roamed around or interfered with Anna's flock.

Version 5.0 – Product Model Version 5.0

TWO ANATOLIANS WORKING IN HARMONY

By January 2017, after weaning the spring lambs, all the flocks were combined. Ever since then, Jenny takes the lead into the camp in the mornings and Anna walks at the back of the flock. Jenny respects Anna totally and there have been no confrontations whatsoever. She is less playful and rough with the sheep than Anna when she was her age. But she is just as affectionate and loves to be cuddled. All in all an absolute success!

Although the jackals are heard almost every night, their tracks are seen on the road and sometimes you might spot one roaming around during the day, the Trollips haven't recorded any losses due to jackal in almost two years. What they have noticed, although not scientifically recorded, is an increase in wildlife such as duiker and reebuck.

AUGUST 2018

Ewes are currently lambing and the jackal calls can be heard every night, but no losses have been recorded. The Trollips sometimes come across one or two jackals in broad daylight and they only trot away slowly, sit down and gaze at the car, or carry on sniffing around or catching flying ants.

Calving has also started. In order to prevent any losses, especially among the young first-calvers, the herd gets checked twice a day and the mothers with new-born calves are brought closer to the farm yard.

So far, there have been no losses due to jackals. Some of the neighbours think that jackals prey on their new-born calves, but Dorothee is not sure whether they can tell for sure that it is not stray dogs from the nearby townships and/or dead-born calves."

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter AUGUST 2018[1085]:

"Predation Information Centre (PMiC) – what services does it provide?

The Predation Management Information Centre (PMiC) is an integral part of the Predation Management Centre (PMC). The objective of the PMiC is to provide landowners, predation management specialists, scientists and policymakers a platform for networking and sharing information to improve predation management. The PMiC strives towards a system that is effective in reducing the negative impact of predation on properties.

Over the past 18 months, the PMiC has created and is continually updating several databases and archives. These include the following:

- *Contact details of role players involved in predation management, which serve as the basis of the networking and information-sharing platform:*
  - *Regulatory authorities/government departments*
  - *Predation management specialists/methods/devices/equipment*
  - *PMF Steering Committee*
  - *PMF regional representatives*
  - *Other role players (universities, scientific research institutions and specialists)*
- *A database and collection of documents (both historical and current) containing information on the legal aspects of predation management on a provincial and national level. It includes relevant laws, regulations and policies on predation management, which are being reviewed to inform future management decisions.*
- *Publications (hard and/or electronic copies) on topics relating to predation management, both local and international. The collection includes peer-reviewed publications and articles published in the popular press to aid efforts in keeping track of research conducted to date and to coordinate and prioritise future research.*

This database and archive serves as an aid in the initiation and support of research projects, as well as to inform present-day predation management practices.

[1085] PMF Newsletter AUGUST 2018; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 – HOA Wegal Version 5.0

To date it has been used to initiate and support projects by providing input and information. Projects include skills, knowledge and ability (SKA) development, the Scientific Assessment on Livestock Predation in South Africa, predator management programmes and post-graduate studies. It has also enabled us to provide input and assistance to government departments in working towards coordinated predation management.

• Management methods, devices or equipment to inform responsible, legal and humane predation management strategies.

• Information on predation/predator control (extent, distribution, etc.). This is the most important information needed for decision makers in the field of predation management, because the relationship between predation, predation management practices and subsequent predation must be able to inform future management strategies. However, this is also where information is mostly lacking. The PMiC is working on a method for quick and easy collection of such information in the field by farmers and specialist predator hunters.

The PMiC is further preparing a series of information leaflets, which will be distributed to relevant stakeholder groups in follow-up e-mail communications.

Whether it is information you need, or whether you can supply the Predation Management information Centre with information, visit the website https://www.ufs.ac.za/natagri/departments-and-divisions/animal-wildlife-and-grassland-sciences-home/alpru/products-and-services or contact them on tel: +27 51 401 2210 / e-mail: PredationMC@ufs.ac.za."

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMF Newsletter AUGUST 2018[1086]:

- **Reasons why monitor farms let predation decline**
- The past 10 years, predation specialist, Niël Viljoen was involved with the monitoring of farms, investigating methods, and management systems for predation control.
- According to Niël, the monitor farms pave the way for South African livestock farmers with concrete evidence of successful livestock farming, in spite of the huge impact of predators. The continuous decline of the national number of livestock lost on monitor farms speaks for itself. He referred to Figure 1 reflecting the successes of monitor farms.
- He remarked that with the exception of a single farm that follows a holistic approach, the main reason for the success was not good flock management only, but the management of predators.
- The impact of new jackals-proof fences on farms without previously any isolation measures in place definitely yielded positive results. The graph clearly show how the management programme jumped in 2012 because of the purchasing of jackals-proof fence material, but continuously yielded good results for the period 2012 to 2016.
- Contributing factors for yielding positive results:
  - Good flock management
  - Good record keeping
  - Sufficient knowledge of predators, their behaviour and biology
  - Good knowledge of the topography of the farm – core areas of predators
  - Preventative control measures
  - Alternating control measures
  - Isolating livestock flocks with jackal-proof fences/electric fences
  - Good management of isolation
  - Good planning, attention and time spent on the predation factor
  - Critical aspects to take note of:

[1086] PMF Newsletter AUGUST 2018; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - H.C. de Waal - Version 5.0

- The farmer's knowledge and involvement with predation management is of paramount importance.
- Predation management must be seen as one of the main lines of a farming enterprise; only then will the long-term benefits with positive financial implications appear.

Representatives of the NWGA, RPO, SAMGA, WRSA and UFS met at the UFS on 5 September 2018 (10h30) before the scheduled meeting of the PMF Steering Committee to deliberate on the discussion document. The feedback (outcome) of the deliberations was reported at the PMF meeting on 6 September 2018 [see minutes paragraph 4.3].

The annual meeting of the PMF was held on Thursday 6 September 2018 in the Board Room of the Landbougebou at the UFS in Bloemfontein. Excerpts of the minutes are quoted below:

*"Present: **NWGA** - Guillau du Toit (National Chairman), Leon de Beer (GM), JR Schlebusch (NC), HB van der Walt (EC), Thomas Barry (WC), Machiel Odendaal (MP), Anton Marx (Free State), Jan Louis Venter (Free State), Bom Louw (KZN), **SA Mohair Growers' Assoc**. - Coligny Stegmann, **Wildlife Ranching SA** - Adri Kitshoff-Botha (CEO), **RPO** - Gerhard Schutte (Small stock industry), Jack van Eeden (Free State), JJ Human (Northern Cape), Hendrik Botha (KZN) , **ALPRU/UFS** - HO De Waal, **PMiC** - Quinette Kruger, **Researcher -** Niël Viljoen, **DAFF** - Victor Musetha, **Environmental Affairs** - Magdel Boshoff, Tim de Jongh (EC), Lourens Goosen (FS), Coenie Erasmus (FS), **By invitation** - Johan Strydom and **PMF Secretariat** - Bonita Francis. Apologies: Carine Annandale (Free State), Jaco van Deventer (Cape Nature), Nico Laubscher (NC – Calvinia), Daan Bodenstein, Sakkie van Zyl (RPO North West), Willie Clack (RPO), Thys de Wet (Scientist), Niel du Preez (NWGA EC), Thomas Mbedzi (DEA), Dirk Krapohl (Northern Cape), Koning Scholtz (Northern Cape), Sam Makhubele (Limpopo Province – Environmental Affairs), Koos Davel (MP RPO), Graham Keet (KZN Environment).*

1. OPENING AND WELCOME

The chairman opened the meeting with scripture reading and Coligny Stegmann with prayer. Members were welcomed and new faces were introduced to the rest of the forum.

Motions of Condolences

- *Dalene de Wet, wife of Petrus de Wet*
- *Father of Niel Viljoen*

2. APOLOGIES

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of minutes of the previous meeting held on 31 August 2017 at the University of the Free State, Bloemfontein was approved with proposed amendments on the proposal of Coligny Stegmann and seconded by Gerhard Schutte.

Cheaper fencing

The meeting was informed of another attempt by PMF to make cheaper fencing available to farmers. Detail to follow in newsletter.

4. MATTERS FOR DISCUSSION

4.1 Scientific Assessment

Leon de Beer informed the meeting that both ministers for DEA and DAFF signed the Scientific Assessment and that the document will be printed and launched in November 2018. He briefly highlighted some of the outcomes of the document. Nelson Mandela University will be requested to extract and compile a summary from extensive document applicable to farmers and make it available to industries. The meeting noted the opinion

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

of Gerhard Schutte that the PMF will have to be show direction in the outcomes of the regulatory objectives.

4.2 Norms & Standards

Magdel Boshoff reported that no progress has been made. Considerable amount of work still needs to be finalized and awaiting the Scientific assessment to see what is applicable to N&S. Taking into account that SA will be launched in November, it allows DEA to finalise the content of legislation.

4.2.1 Coordination of provincial predation needs

At the previous meeting, it was decided that Industry should determine those issues regarding DCA management that needs coordination. Thereafter provincial authorities will discuss and address the issues.

As nothing was yet received, Magdel Boshoff suggested that discussions take place during the same time that accreditation meeting with environmental officials take place. Industries need to provide the input for discussion.

Decision: To request Provincial PMF's to provide detail of areas of coordination and it be channeled to DEA.

PMF Secretariat scanned the minutes of previous meeting and took note of point 3 of the decision where it is noted that the finalization of Norms & Standards is critical as it will address the uniformity within provinces.

4.3 Predation Management Information Centre (PMiC)

Prof. HO de Waal[1087] reported on the solutions for human wildlife conflict, which are informed by institutional memory and an operational management information service (MIS). The PMiC provides this service and the system is constantly collecting, analyzing, interpreting and distributing relevant information in SA.

He referred to a cell phone APP that was developed by Free State University and the use of 2 systems by farmers and hunters. He elaborated how the APP will be utilized to determine predation losses linked to logistics and maps.

On a question by Machiel Odendaal how the farmer would benefit from the technology, De Waal replied that technology transfer will take place through information days, training, therefore University Free State will address meetings and provide training.

De Waal said that all information is available and should be shared with PMiC, and that it is a criminal offence if someone has information, but do not share it.

Gerhard Schutte provided a summary on the way forward with the PMiC:

Further funding of PMiC

In terms of the current operations of the PMiC, the decision was taken that 2 industries withdraw funding for Year 2, but that other 2 will continue with agreed and allocated funding towards PMiC until the end of February 2019, when the contract for year 2 concludes. Thereafter, on recommendation of the outcomes of scheduled workshop, the PMF will decide how to utilize limited funding.

4.4 Formulation of PMF as legal entity

Gerhard Schutte briefed the meeting that the PMF will be formalized into a legal entity with its own brand, own constitution with code of conduct, bank account, budget and in the future, do certain services for commodity organisations.

[1087] De Waal, HO & Kruger, Quinette, 2018. Mobile technology to collect information on predation losses and predator control. PMF meeting 6 September 2018. Agriculture Board Room, UFS.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

Should funding become available from industries or wherever, funds will go to the new entity, the PMF, who will then, if they identify the need, get service providers to execute the project.

Workshop

As there are 3 fields in which the PMF requires direction, the planning of 2 workshops was discussed, but to start off with only 1, requesting Dr. John Purchase, AgriBIZ to play facilitating role. The 2 fields deemed important to take predation management forward:

(1) R&D and information – to involve all tertiary institutions

(2) Training – to involve all training institutions, hunters, predation specialists who perform hunting etc.

(3) (3) Regulatory environment.

Terms of reference for the workshop are very important. One can no longer work in silos and one need to agree how to leverage funders on other platforms. The workshop is intended to be held early December where after the PMF, as the new legal entity, will decide on what services they can afford after taken into account what funds are available.

- *In terms of regulations and legislation, the PMF can only create an enabling environment.*
- *Workshop to be held under the flagship of the PMF.*

4.5 Poison getters

Leon de Beer briefly provided background to the pilot project that was run on the farm of David Wardle in Cathcart.

The forum was informed of a meeting between Leon de Beer and Dr. Ben Allen from Australia and their attempt to conduct research by testing poison in South Africa. As the PMF do not want to be connected to poison research, their function will be to assist in the supply of getters for testing. The research project will prove that poison is target specific as a pull action and not a chewing action is necessary for release of poison.

Mr. Johan Strydom was invited to elaborate on the use of the "Silent Solution" as a method in the predation management toolbox. The poison getter is based on the same principle as a "coyote getter" and this device has been developed and is triggered by a spring mechanism and therefore not bound by fire-arm legislation. It has also been included in the Norms and Standards for the management of damage causing animals, especially stray dogs. A company called Predation Solutions has been established and Strydom is also the manufacturer of the cyanide capsule.

As the Silent Solution has now made a comeback as a tool in the toolbox, Tim de Jongh is of the opinion to do a survey to determine the needs for such a type of device before Strydom embarks in the manufacturing of the devices.

The way forward:

1. As funding is required for independent entrepreneur, the PMF is not in a position to consider the business plan as proposed by Strydom.

2. As the Silent solution is regarded as the ideal tool for stray dogs, Strydom to change the content of business plan accordingly.

3. Free State DES has a database of persons who have permits for getters – they just need to receive additional training.

4. Two actions to control the getter:

4.1 in order to use the device, you need to be adequately trained

4.2 in order to use the poison, you need compliance.

5. PMF have endorsed the project by providing Strydom with a letter of support to strengthen negotiations to use the Silent solution as predation management tool.

6. On a question whether plans are in place for the future manufacturing of tool if Strydom had to retire, he confirmed plans of contingency.

7. Lifetime of information that needs to be invested for South Africa.

Version 5.0 - Hoole Wiegel - Version 5.0

Take note of the following process:

1. DEA have already formulised the process by the containment of this predation method in the Norms and Standards for DCA.

2. DEA would require framework of Tim de Jongh to determine what to add to the N&S.

3. Training of Niel Viljoen does not include this tool.

4. DEA would require a copy of the training material of Johan Strydom to discuss with provincial authorities in order to see if they would be willing to issue permits and get certificate of compliance. Outcome to be discussed at PMF Steering committee.

5. Gerhard Schutte – to invite Johan Strydom to national executive and provincial road shows and information days. Each industry to utilize Johan Strydom in whatever manner they feel fit.

6. Put into place the 1-day training for those persons who already have permits.

Who must do the training

1. Add person to the database

2. Tim de Jongh referred to EC hunters who have certificate of competence for old getter. All they would need is a one-day course on the functioning of the new device, where after they will be qualified to use the device.

Proposal: Hunters' who already have a permit for getters, would only require a 1 day course to familiarize themselves with new device. To possibly include a registration fee to purchase the toolbox.

Decision:

(1) The PMF supports the process

(2) To discuss at the next PMF Steering Committee meeting

(3) Funding requirements will not be for the PMF, but external sources.

4.6 Predation management training

4.6.1 Adoption and underwriting of accredited courses (arising)

The meeting took cognizance of detailed explanation and background to the necessity of establishing an approved qualification and accredited training system, which have appeared in April 2018 newsletter, PMF website and NWGA facebook page).

Coenie Erasmus, Free State environmental affairs remarked that the call and shoot method gives an 80% success rate for jackal in the Free State and it is used without a permit. "Now you want to permit us". He will discuss the matter with Magdel Boshoff.

Boshoff reaffirmed that what the Norms & Standards are asking for is to be "adequately trained', and not necessarily that you require a permit.

According to DEA, the person needs to be adequately trained and the Norms and Standards are not prescriptive to the methods.

4.6.2 Predation Training programme

Niel Viljoen provided a detailed presentation with the ultimate message that the programme that he is involved is preventative, rather than finding a dead lamb or jackal. He further stated that he supports the project of the University of Free State. The purpose of his training is aimed at the transfer of knowledge and by physically assisting the farmer on a continuous basis. He provided statistics of number of courses presented over the past 10 years.

Predation and the way forward

- *Training (monitored and accredited)*
- *Cooperation (farmers, farmer associations, industries)*
- *Subsidized projects (such as the fencing project)*

Version 5.0 - Pro de Waal - Version 5.0

- *Correct expenditure of limited funding*

JR Schlebusch proposed the training of students in universities / colleges. Logistically it makes sense to train them, as they are all in one space. Viljoen indicated that he has recognized the need and that training has been given at agricultural schools and Grootfontein.

4.7 National strategy – predators escaping protected areas

Magdel Boshoff referred to recent Research Indaba that she was unable to attend. As one of the key themes was predation management, she will check on the outcome of the Indaba. National strategy has not been initiated as DEA do not have any funding.

Magdel Boshoff identified the possibility of including this matter under the umbrella of Operation Phakisa, National Predation Management Strategy.

HO De Waal referred to research article by Dr. Nico Avenant on the movement of black back jackal to national parks and undertook to send it to the PMF secretariat.

4.8 Stray dogs

Leon de Beer reported that he is waiting for progress from Ndlambe and Steve Tshwete municipalities and their intention of having discussions with local municipalities who have proper legislation in place to control stray dogs. As per the undertaking of Ndlambe and Steve Tshwete municipalities during March 2018, follow up meetings with PMF and SALGA to be scheduled in 6 months to report on the progress.

4.9 Predator fencing support

The meeting was informed of another attempt by PMF to make cheaper fencing available to farmers. Detail to follow in newsletter.

4.10 Baboon Damage Interest Group

The meeting took cognizance of outcomes of meeting of Baboon Damage Interest Group who met early May in Johannesburg.

4.11 Provincial reports

4.11.1 Bush pigs

Thomas Barry raised the problem of bush pigs who are damaging mielie fields and that farmers are using collared dogs who are trained to only hunt bush pigs, to assist with the problem. However, pigs are running into San parks and the dogs are not allowed onto the property. Farmers are struggling to make contact with Sanparks to discuss the problem.

Decision: Contacts from Magdel Boshoff and Tim de Jongh to be sent to Thomas Barry via the PMF Secretariat.

4.11.2 East Cape – Leopard problem

No progress whatsoever was made in the Eastern Cape and permits are still not issued for leopards. According to Tim de Jongh, meetings were attended and letters were written to authorities of affected areas, but still without any effect.

Eastern Cape PMF has established a paper trail and have made appointments to meet with the relevant authorities, without success.

Decision:

- *To put more pressure on the EC PMF to address matter and take it to a higher level with the necessary paper trail*
- *Letter of support from PMF (national) to EC PMF.*

Illegal hunting of dogs

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

Tim de Jongh expressed concern over the name and proposed a change "stray dogs/vagrant control". As the issue of illegal hunting does not lie on the table of PMF, but Agri SA, the meeting nevertheless accepted the terminology as suggested by Tim de Jongh.

The meeting concluded at 12:30"

On 12 September 2018 Prof. HO de Waal (ALPRU/UFS) and Mrs Quinette Kruger (PMiC/UFS) gave a short presentation[1088] at the RPO National Congress, held at the Royal Elephant Hotel & Conference Centre, Centurion, Gauteng Province regarding the need for institutional memory and a management information system (MIS) regarding predation management in South Africa. Dr. Antonie Geyer, UFS, accompanied them.

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMF Newsletter SEPTEMBER 2018[1089]:

- **Order mesh wire at reduced prices!**
- Die Koöperasie, bases in Humansdorp, in cooperation with the Predation Management Forum (PMF), now provides mesh wire at reduces prices. Die Koöperasie will donate 2,5% of the value of orders received and paid in full towards predation management training. This promotion is valid until the end of September 2018.
- Clients from areas where Die Koöperasie do not have commercial branches can contact Gerrit du Preez at 072 499 3135 or gerritdp@humkoop.co.za. Click here for detailed information: https://www.pmfsa.co.za/images/news/Sifdraad_Promosie1.pdf

The following item (partly translated) was reported in the PMF Newsletter SEPTEMBER 2018[1090]:

"This works for me… (a farmer's story)

We are asking some farmers to share those practices that prove successful under their farming conditions and circumstances. Last month, Dorothee Trollip, who farms in the Maclear district, shared her heart-warming experience about how Anatolian sheepdogs keep predators at bay. This month we focus on jackal-proof fencing."

- Erik Alexander of Korthoek, Trompsburg, explained the reason for erecting jackals-proof fences:
- My annual losses were from 150 to 170 lambs. In the area where my neighbours and I employed hunters with the call-and-shoot method, 130 jackals and nine caracals were shot in a period of eight years. In spite of the hunting, my lamb losses still increased.
- I met Niël Viljoen through Jan-Louis Venter of the NWGA. Niël and I inspected the area and his advice was to erect mesh wire to exclude jackals from the lamb camps on the farm.
- Erecting fences
- Fortunately, BKB had a special offer on mesh wire. We started enclosing 15,2 km with mesh wire. A team of eight workers took six months to complete the task. All fences and anchors were replaced; gates were inserted in the cross-running fence lines to facilitate easier patrolling; and a road was build next to the fence. After these tasks, the real work started – the bottom of fence line had to be packed with stones/rocks on both sides. In my area, stones/rocks are scares and the furthest point to collect was 9 km from the fence. With a tractor and two trailers, it took three men a further six months to complete the task. The total cost of erecting the fences and packing the aprons with stones/rocks, was R25/m.

[1088] De Waal, HO & Kruger, Quinette, 2018. Coordinated Predation Management - informed by institutional memory & management information system. 27th National RPO Congress. The Royal Elephant Hotel & Conference Centre, Centurion. 11-12 September 2018.
[1089] PMF Newsletter SEPTEMBER 2018; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[1090] PMF Newsletter SEPTEMBER 2018; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

- Was it worth the effort and money?
- Yes, for sure! In the first year, only 12 lambs were lost. The second year I lost three small lambs to an African wild cat. In the third year, it was again 42 lambs. A black-backed jackal bitch crept through an aardvark hole underneath the fence and whelped in the aardvark hole. She was hunting for seven pups. When the holes were discovered, they were killed. In spite of the losses, something positive was learnt. The male was on the other side of the fence, and isolated for six weeks. Eventually he was killed outside the jackals-proof fence.
- After this experience, I was convinced about the efficacy of jackals-proof fences, as long as a jackal is not inside the fenced in camps. The previous year sis lambs were lost to African wild cats and this far this season only two lambs.
- Do not relax
- Do not think predation management is over when you have erected the fence. The fence must be maintained and patrolled every second day. The biggest problem is African porcupine and aardvark burrowing underneath the fences.
- In conclusion
- It was worth the time and money to erect the jackal-proof fences. It was one of my best investments ever.
- It is interesting, the farmers I have contacted and who have erected jackal-proof fences are very positive, such as DG Snyman and Dr. Nolte Troskie. Those who were negative are those who have not yet tested jackal-proof fences.
- I believe that if more jackal-proof fences were erected, the predation problem would be better under control.

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMF Newsletter SEPTEMBER 2018[1091]:

- **Electrifying camps yield increased lambing percentage**
- Van Zyl Naudé, the 2018 Northern Cape Young Farmer of the Year, better known as Zylie, said in an interview with Landbouweekblad that the electrification of lamb camps against damage-causing animals was one of the steps implemented to increase lambing percentage on his farming near Richmond. Other farmers should also consider it.

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMF Newsletter SEPTEMBER 2018[1092]:

- **A "Toolbox" of control methods**
- According to Niël Viljoen, predation specialist, predators can be controlled with a range of methods. See the infographics to compose a predation "toolbox".

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

[1091] PMF Newsletter SEPTEMBER 2018; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[1092] PMF Newsletter SEPTEMBER 2018; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

- **When is a control method regarded as successful?**
- Success is not measured by the number of predators killed, by rather by a financially attainable yardstick such as ensuring a continuous growth in weaning percentage.
- **Why are the specific control methods successful?**
- Good planning, followed by applying good management continuously, risk management and landowners who are really focussed on predation management rather than predator management, determine success.

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter OCTOBER 2018[1093]:

> ***"This works for me… (a farmer's story)***
>
> *We have been asking some farmers to share those practices in managing predators that prove successful under their particular farming conditions and circumstances. Last month, Erik Alexander, who farms in the Trompsburg district, explained how jackal-proof fencing keeps predators at bay. This month we focus on alpacas.*
>
> *Zeekoeivlei in the Struisbaai district is one of 27 monitor farms that are monitored and evaluated by Niel Viljoen. Owner Pieter Albertyn claims that alpacas are very effective herd animals to help reduce predation. He explains how he uses them to cut losses by 70%.*
>
> *The first thing to remember when using alpacas as guards, is that they are grass eaters. They are not suited for killing predators, but for chasing them away (they have no fangs). An Anatolian dog will kill predators. Other advantages over an Anatolian dog is that no special attention needs to be given to the alpaca, such as feeding stations, and other wildlife like rabbits and small antelope also remain undisturbed.*
>
> *Alpacas fare best against caracal and jackal. They are not effective against honey badgers. If losses occur because of a caracal, for instance, and a trained alpaca guard is put with ewes and lambs, the first night a lamb will be taken and some of it will be eaten. The second night you might find a dead lamb, but not predated on. From the third night, predation should stop. An alpaca has a nasty kick, it bites, and it can spit. If spat*

[1093] PMF Newsletter OCTOBER 2018; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

on, you will need to wash because of the smell. When moving sheep, they can work well with sheepdogs, but I have had two occasions where a vet had to stitch up sheepdogs after they had been kicked by an alpaca. When moving sheep, get the alpaca to lead the flock like a Judas sheep at an abattoir.

The trick is to make the alpaca think it is a sheep. The more it associates with the flock, the better it works. The best guards are fully grown when they are at least three years of age and weigh at least 70 kg. When standing next to them they should look imposing and not like something you want to cuddle. They need to spend at least two weeks in a kraal with a small group of sheep to bond with the sheep. Unfortunately, like people, you get good ones and bad ones. I find that about 70% of them make good guard animals. The dominant ones generally work better. Where possible, I put two with a flock. You just need to watch that they do not form their own herd away from the flock of sheep.

The flock should not exceed 150 animals. In addition, the camps that they walk in should be open grassland but not too bushy. If grazing is very short, their effectiveness is also reduced when the flock is spread over the whole camp. If a sheep alarm is used with an alpaca, always find the alpaca in the camp and look in the same direction that it is looking. Most of the time the problem – be it a predator or stock thief – is where the alpaca is looking.

The alpacas get the same parasites as sheep and need to be dosed and inoculated just like sheep. They are susceptible to pulpy kidney just as sheep are. They need to be shorn once a year. The young cria wool is more valuable than merino wool but the older animals' wool blows out to over 30 microns and is worth about R40 per kilogram."

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter OCTOBER 2018[1094]:

*"**Scientific assessment to be released soon***

The anticipated scientific assessment on livestock predation and its management in South Africa is in its printing stage and the publication will be released during a launch attended by ministers of Environmental Affairs and Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries. The date for this inaugurate occasion still needs to be finalised.

This comprehensive assessment is a global first, and the economic impact may be relatively small in terms of GDP, but high at the individual farmer scale, with impacts on the rural economy, employment and food security.

The outcome of the assessment shows that commercial and communal livestock farmers face similar predation challenges and that there is no simple solution in managing livestock predation. The assessment highlights the fact that legislation and regulations need an overhaul and that an adaptive management approach needs to make better use of existing information. It further encourages collaborative relationships between livestock managers, researchers and policymakers."

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter OCTOBER 2018[1095]:

Demography and morphometry of black-backed jackals Canis mesomelas in South Africa and Namibia

Human–carnivore conflict is a global phenomenon. Consequently, in a country like South Africa, predation management is a necessary but sometimes controversial activity, and the role of the government is both to provide oversight and to save livestock and protect wildlife.

Article by HO de Waal at https://www.pmfsa.co.za/images/news/BBacked_jackal.pdf

[1094] PMF Newsletter OCTOBER 2018; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[1095] PMF Newsletter OCTOBER 2018; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

It should be noted that the PMF's call on 10 November 2015 to tertiary institutions for their "show of interest" to establish a predation management information centre, stated the following: *"A three year contract will (be) entered into between the successful applicant (institution) and the National Woolgrowers Association (NWGA) as legal entity acting on behalf of the PMF. The contract will have performance clauses with a probationary period of three years. Should the successful institution perform satisfactory according the key performance areas identified in the contract, the PMF will consider extending the contract for another period as determined by itself."* The PMiC complied with most of the requirements as agreed in the MOU's with the four producers' organisations; therefore, "…*the decision was taken that 2 industries withdraw funding for Year 2…"* was apparently based on other considerations.

The PredSA was officially launched on Friday 16 November 2018 at the Nelson Mandela University, Port Elizabeth[1096] and two publications[1097] [1098] were handed to senior officials of the Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries and the Department of Environmental Affairs. The following is claimed on the back cover of the book:

> "'*Livestock Predation and its Management in South Africa' represents a global first in terms of undertaking a scientific assessment on this issue. The topics covered range from history to law and ethics to ecology. This book will thus be of interest to a broad range of readers, from the layperson managing livestock to those studying this form of human wildlife conflict. Principally, this book is aimed at helping agriculture and conservation policymakers and managers to arrive at improved approaches for reducing livestock predation, while at the same time contributing to the conservation of our natural predators*."

In a separate, smaller book (*Summary for Policymakers*), it was stated in greater context:

> "*Predators are valued as part of South Africa's natural heritage, but are also a source of human-wildlife conflict when they place livestock at risk. Managing this conflict ultimately falls to individual livestock farmers, but their actions need to be guided by policy and legislation where broader societal interests are at stake. The complexity of the issue together with differing societal perspectives and approaches to dealing with it, results in livestock predation management being challenging and potentially controversial.*

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

[1096] The launch **Programme** included:

Welcome
Professor Muthwa, Vice-Chancellor, Nelson Mandela University
Overview of the PredSA Scientific Assessment on Livestock Predation Admissions/CAAR
Professor Kerley, Director: Centre for African Conservation Ecology, Nelson Mandela University
Emerging livestock farmers views of PredSA
Mr Makinana, director: Cape Wools SA
PredSA and the Predation Management Forum
Mr du Toit, Chair: Predation Management forum
Implications of the Findings for Agriculture
Mr Kgobokoe, Deputy Director General: PPME Dept of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries
Implications of the Findings for Environmental Management
Ms Mancotywa, Acting Deputy director General: Biodiversity and Conservation Dept of Environmental Affairs
Handover and launch of the Publication
Professor Kerley, Director: Centre for African Conservation Ecology, Nelson Mandela University
Vote of thanks
Professor Muronga, Executive Dean: Faculty of Science, Nelson Mandela University.

[1097] Kerley, G.I.H., Wilson, S.L. & Balfour, D. (Eds.) 2018. *Livestock Predation and its Management in South Africa: A Scientific Assessment.* Centre for African Conservation Ecology, Nelson Mandela University, Port Elizabeth.

[1098] Kerley, G.I.H., Behrens, K.G., Carruthers, J., Diemont, M., du Plessis, J.J., Minnie, L., Somers, M.J., Tambling, C.J., Turpie, J., Wilson, S.L. & Balfour, D. 2018. Summary for Policymakers. In: *Livestock Predation and its Management in South Africa: A Scientific Assessment* (EDS Kerley, G.I.H., Wilson, S.L. & Balfour, D.) Centre for African Conservation Ecology, Nelson Mandela University, Port Elizabeth, 7-14.

Despite livestock predation having been a societal issue for millennia, and considerable recent research focussed on the matter, the information needed to guide evidence-based policy and legislation is scattered, often challenged and, to an unknown extent, incomplete. Recognising this, the South African Department of Environmental Affairs together with the Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, and leading livestock industry role players, commissioned a scientific assessment on livestock predation management. The assessment followed a rigorous process and was overseen by an independent group to ensure fairness. Over 60 national and international experts contributed either by compiling the relevant information or reviewing these compilations. In addition an open stakeholder review process enabled interested parties to offer their insights into the outcomes. The findings of the scientific assessment are presented in this volume.

'Livestock Predation and its Management in South Africa' represents a global first in terms of undertaking a scientific assessment on this issue. The topics covered range from history to law and ethics to ecology. This book will thus be of interest to a broad range of readers, from the layperson managing livestock to those studying this form of human wildlife conflict. Principally, this book is aimed at helping agricultural and conservation policymakers and managers to arrive at improved approaches for reducing livestock predation, while at the same time contributing to the conservation of our natural predators."

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter NOVEMBER 2018[1099]:

*"**Historic first for predation management in South Africa!***

A single document containing detailed and current insight and knowledge into the complex situation of predation management has been finalised and was launched at the Nelson Mandela University last week.

In this historic first (nationally and globally), the Scientific Assessment for Livestock Predation and its Management in South Africa will form the basis for contemplating policy development. It will also strengthen Government's resolve to develop evidence-based policy and to recognise that in many complex situations, such as where there is predation on livestock, there is no silver-bullet solution.

The partnership of Government, industry, stakeholders and leading researchers emerged to resource and formulate the Scientific Assessment and shows a strong commitment to address the conflicts around livestock predation management.

During this event, Prof. Graham Kerley of the Nelson Mandela University provided an overview of the assessment and felt confident that the document will contribute towards reducing conflict and sustaining both agricultural production and biodiversity.

Sipiwo Makinana, who represented the wool industry, highlighted the plights of emerging livestock farmers on predation and acknowledged the outcome of the assessment that commercial and communal livestock farmers face similar predation challenges.

Guillau du Toit, chairman of the Predation Management Forum (PMF) welcomed the assessment. He referred to the chapter on policy and recommendations to Government as the most essential part of the study, as regulations and legislation, which impact the production practices of livestock and wildlife ranching producers, need an overhaul. He thanked Prof. Kerley and his team for the inclusivity of the process and the involvement of a magnitude of researchers, authors and reviewers.

The implications of the findings for Government were welcomed by both the Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (DAFF) and the Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA). Mr Joe Kgobokoe, representing DAFF, and Ms Mancotywa from DEA both acknowledged the requirement of a strategic national research programme to provide

[1099] PMF Newsletter NOVEMBER 2018; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - PDF de Wael - Version 5.0

evidence for policy development, as well as closer cooperation between policy developers, livestock managers/farmers and researchers.

This assesment is aimed at helping agricultural and conservation policymakers and managers to arrive at improved approaches for reducing livestock predation, while at the same time contributing to the conservation of our natural predators. The PMF would like to thank all the role players who helped to make the publication possible."

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMF Newsletter NOVEMBER 2018[1100]:

- **It works for me … (the tale of a farmer)**
- We have asked farmers to us about their successful predator management practices in their specific farming areas and circumstances. Last month Pieter Albertyn, farming in the Struisbaai district, explained how herd guard animal such as alpacas are effective to repel predators. This month we focus on electrified fences.
- Anton Marx, an executive of the Free State NWGA, farms since 1991 with his father on the farm Karroo in the Brandfort district, mainly with Dohne Merino's and a few cattle.
- In 2000, a crossroad decision was needed, because the Marx's could not farm sustainable anymore because of losses by 'vermin.' Anton asked the BKB agent to find a buyer for their ewes so that they can change over to cattle farming. The agent convinced him not to make and emotional decision but first consider all options. He started researching different fencing methods and opted for electrified fencing.
- What influenced his decision and how did he start?
- He visited a few farmers, but could not really get advice, because electrified fences were at that stage still a very new method to control 'vermin.'
- Anton started by only fencing his lamb camps to prevent lamb losses. In the beginning, the method (see photo 1 - offset bracket) was effective, but soon the jackals learned to jump over the three strands. He inserted two current wires in the existing fence, but it was still not 100% effective. Although losses decreased, he was not completely satisfied. He decided to take all the fences, prepare the ground surface and erect the fence again (see photo 2). This was about 12 years ago and the method is still used with great success.
- Monitor farms – why involved in it?
- During the fencing, Anton got involved with the NWGA and the monitor farms which were managed by the well-known "jackal fundi", Niël Viljoen. According to annual information and statistics, Niël will confirm that electrified fences are definitely one of the most effective methods for 'vermin' control, provided fences are erected correct without taking shortcuts.
- Maintenance and repairs is very important and must be done as regular as possible.
  - Inspect fences at least once a week (not only when the jackal is already caught, because that is often the case).
  - Spray fences once or twice in a season with poison, depending on the rainfall.
  - Blocks should preferably not exceed 400 ha, because when a jackal does enter, it is much easier to control it.
- Hints
  - Use only 2,24 full galvanised steel wire.
  - Compare prices of different suppliers for your requirements.
  - Use as much as possible of the droppers and poles of the old fences.
  - Buy the correct energiser
  - Place the energiser as close as possible to the fence
  - Spray the plants under the fence well in advance
  - Less losses, more money in your pocket
- The reason why Anton fences a new block every season is because he feels the success of electrified in his pocket. His neighbour agrees that if he fenced on credit, it would

[1100] PMF Newsletter NOVEMBER 2018; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

version 5.0 - HOcc Wael - version 5.0

be repaid in two years. Initially it seems very expensive, but if all the losses are considered, it constitute only a fraction of the input. If it were at all possible, Anton would have erected electrified fences from the first day he stepped on the farm.

- He shares a practical example: during the April lambing season, no lambs were lost inside the fences, but outside a number of mature ewes were predated. Undoubtedly, electrified fences rekindled his passion fie sheep farming. Contact him at 083 518 3803.

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter NOVEMBER 2018[1101]:

*"**Record predation losses on this app!***

The Predation Management Information Centre (PMiC) has developed an app for the recording of predation management information.

Everybody knows that predation is a serious problem faced by livestock farmers and some wildlife ranchers.

But exactly how big is the problem? Which areas in the country are experiencing the most damage? Why do some farmers and ranchers experience much more damage than others in the same area? How effective are the different methods of predation management really when it comes to reducing predation on livestock farms or wildlife ranches?

These are the questions we have been asking for many years. Although research has tried to answer these questions, a single research project – or even a set of research projects, for that matter – cannot answer all these questions at once, at least not across the entire country. Why not? Because each research project has its limits: time, money, labour, equipment, etc. Different research projects also generally make use of different methods and approaches, meaning that the results of the different studies cannot always be compared. These are just some of the things that have recently been identified as hampering attempts to address the negative impact of predation.

The information available on predation, predation management and the predators implicated for the damage has not enabled the development of practical, responsible management practices for different scenarios. To have information is good, but a large set of information that covers a large geographical area (for example the country or a province) and long, continuous periods is more useful than having many small datasets covering small areas and short periods of time. There are also still many information gaps between different areas and periods.

We identified the need for a method to collect detailed, standardised data (one format so that results of different studies are comparable) on predation management on a large scale and over long periods to bridge these gaps. With the help (and patience) of CyberTracker software developers and a few dedicated individuals, two databases have been created with the aid of software designed specifically to collect data via mobile applications (cell phone apps). The purpose of the apps is to address the lack of information regarding the extent (how much) and distribution (where) of predation and the effects (reduction or mitigation) of implementing predation management strategies. This will generate large databases from which studies could be conducted, covering the range of aspects involved in predation and predation management. The collection of information over long periods of time allows the monitoring of predation and how predation management strategies in different areas affect the recurrence of predation. This type of information can then help formulate best practices for predation management.

Why is this much information necessary?

Put quite simply: it will give us a better picture of predation across the country. In other words, the current situation regarding predation on livestock farms and wildlife ranches

[1101] PMF Newsletter NOVEMBER 2018; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - Pro de Waal - Version 5.0

can be evaluated. If you look at the bigger picture, areas with higher predation vs. lower predation could be identified.

From there, certain areas could be zoomed into to investigate why some areas/farmers experience more predation, or which methods or combinations of methods of predation management work better, and under which circumstances.

With long-term data, the situation can be monitored. Eventually, with data collected over several seasons or years, we will be able to identify patterns and make predictions regarding possible future predation, so that better preventive (precautionary measures) can be taken.

Predation takes place every day and predation management activities are performed every day, but information is difficult to obtain.

So how will the apps help to collect this type of information?

Most of us have a cell phone, and we carry it with us wherever we go. So: whenever you are out and about on your farm and you come across the carcass of one of your livestock or another farm animal, or you realise that some animals are missing, you simply take out your phone, open the Stock Losses app, tap to select a few options (for example: identify the animal – is it a sheep, cow or goat; identify the possible cause of death; take a photograph in the case of a carcass; enter some other details about the animals, if you so choose), and then tap on the "save and send" button.

With the Predator Control app, information on the predator species, the method of control and other details about the animal (optional) are recorded. The information is sent directly to a central database at the PMiC and is ready for analysis.

The applications are compatible with any mobile device with an android-operating system (cell phones, tablets and PDAs) but are not available for use on Apple devices yet.

Anyone interested in using this tool to record predation losses on their farms/in their area, can contact the PMiC at 051 401 2210"

2019

After being involved with predator control as a trapper for decades, Mr. Peter Schneekluth turned writer and penned down some of his experiences in a 29 chapter book, although as he stated '*This book is a work of fiction. Any resemblance to actual events or persons, living or dead, is purely coincidental.*' The Introduction of the book[1102] is cited below:

"*This book is, for the most part, about the experiences of a trapper and the protection of livestock and of a trapper's efforts to do so. Other than by livestock farmers, little is known about the work of a trapper. City dwellers, especially those that I have christened the 'over-educated set', and office-bound bureaucrats, know nothing or little about it, and of this they create a picture of the trapper as a primitive brute, killing noble predators to protect stupid, idiotic sheep. Yes, that's what they think and curse me for.*

Before age dims my mental capabilities, I thought I would write about this contentious issue. It was my vague intention to finish this tale within a period of five years or so, but it wasn't to be. Before I could hand the raw text to my editor, a dozen years had elapsed. It was a sobering experience and to my dismay I experienced difficulties recalling actions and events of the beginning chapters I had written years earlier. Some of the contents of those early chapters had faded like the once bright colours of woollen threads in a tapestry that had taken years to complete. The weaver, however, was not allowed to re-dye the faded colours; it was forbidden, even punishable. Fortunately, these rigid rules do not apply to writing. For a writer it is not a problem to return to the faded chapters and improve them by rewriting.

[1102] Schneekluth, Peter, 2019. The Fence Runner The Tale of a jackal hunter in South Africa. Pinetown Printers.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

This tale could be likened to a tapestry depicting South African life in the semi-desert regions where only sheep, goats and springbok can survive, and then only close to the waters of lifegiving boreholes. At the same time, these animals have to be protected against predators and stock thieves. Traps, poison, guns, hounds, helicopters and strong fences must be employed to keep at bay jackals, lynx, leopards, hyenas, baboons and stock thieves. If not, a stockman will have to file for bankruptcy. It is a conflict comparable to low-level warfare between man and beast, and never-ending.

Woven into my tapestry are scenes of sheep husbandry, of farm life, of the indigenous people, of historical events, benign and catastrophic, of renegades and maverick characters.

An ordinary day in the life of a trapper is filled with walking and stumbling over rough terrain along fences, looking for predator tracks and tell-tale hair on barbed wire, or bending down to investigate droppings and sniffing for pungent urine left by the creatures with their fearsome canines, claws, and for kills, fresh or not so fresh.

Whilst searching for these clues, the lone trapper, walking undisturbed for hours on end, cannot help but reflect and reminisce, aided by long nights of solitude in abandoned farmhouses. Naturally, some of these mental meanderings have flowed into this tale.

I have mentioned many plant names and some tree species but, as this not a book on botany, I have refrained from adding their scientific names. All plants mentioned, mainly bushes and shrubs, are of the hardy, drought-resistant kind.

The fact that South Africa is inhabited by a complex, multi-tongued, heterogeneous populace has led me to use many words and some phrases that might not be familiar to the reader; therefore, I have included a glossary that I am sure will aid in a better understanding of the tale.

Finally, the mother tongue of the author is not English but German, and therefore I suspect that a keen reader will surely detect a number of imperfections. I hope that I will be excused for that."

The PMF decided on 6 September 2018 at the UFS in Bloemfontein to schedule a "*workshop is intended to be held early December*" (of 2018). However, without prior communication by the organisers the workshop was rescheduled for 21 February 2019 at the Nelson Mandela University in Port Elizabeth. The University of the Free State received the following invitation (dated 11 January 2019) from the PMF Chairman:

"*Sir / Madam,*

PREDATION WORKSHOP: TRAINING AND RESEARCH

A Scientific Assessment for Livestock predation has recently been finalized and was officially launched on 16 November 2018. The Predation Management Forum (PMF) is subsequently organising a workshop to involve roleplayers and stakeholders to develop a framework that will pave the way forward regarding research that will be practical for all to support and actively participate, as well as for training/extension and development in predation management.

You / Your institution have been recognized to play a meaningful role in this workshop and are therefore invited to attend a Predation Management Workshop on ***Thursday, 21 February 2019 in Port Elizabeth.*** *The workshop will be held at the Nelson Mandela University, Centre for African Conservation Ecology (ACE) in Port Elizabeth and commence at 09:00 and conclude at approximately 17:00.*

The theme for the workshop will be ***"Predation challenges in livestock production: Research and development on the way moving forward".***

The proposed programme is scheduled as follows:

Facilitator – Dr. John Purchase, CEO for AgriBIZ

1) BACKGROUND AND INDUSTRY NEEDS *- Guillau du Toit, PMF Chairman*

2) SCIENTIFIC ASSESSMENT *- Prof. Graham Kerley, Nelson Mandela University*

Version 5.0 - PJ de Waal - Version 5.0

3) RESEARCH MODEL *- Hugh Campbell, General Manager Hortgro Science to elaborate on model that the Fruit Industry use for setting research priorities, funding models, stakeholder involvement etc.*

4) PROTOCOL FOR RESEARCH PRIORITIES – NATIONAL GOVERNMENT

- *DEA*
- *DAFF*

5) WAY FORWARD

6) CLOSURE

If you could please indicate your attendance to Bonita Francis, PMF Secretariat at (041) 365 5030 or email nwga@nwga.co.za by no later than Friday, 8 February 2019.

Thank you for your attention and we look forward to meaningful discussions resulting in a workable plan to take predation training and research forward.

Kind regards"

The generic invitation did not indicate by name the tertiary institutions, which have been invited. Therefore, realising the importance of such a workshop on predation management, the UFS mandated a broad delegation to attend the workshop. Furthermore, the PMC/UFS also works in close cooperation with the National Museum, Bloemfontein and Glen Agricultural institute. Therefore, on 25 January 2019 it was suggested to the organisers that three colleagues be invited to represent their institutions:

"*Good day, Bonita*

Thank you for the invitation to the Predation Management Workshop.

Prof. Frikkie Neser, Dr. Antonie Geyer, Prof HO de Waal and Mrs. Quinette Kruger will be representing the UFS and the PMiC at the workshop on 21 February 2019.

On behalf of the National Museum (Dr. Nico Avenant and Dr. Jurie du Plessis) and the Glen Agricultural Institute of the Free State Department of Agriculture and Rural Development (Mr. Andries Strauss), we would like to ask whether invitations may also be extended to these gentlemen to represent the two institutions. It is important that these people attend as they are actively involved in Predation Research Management.

May we also request that the following item be added to the agenda: "The Role of the Predation Management Centre", by Prof. Frikkie Neser? We suggest that this presentation follows Item 2 by Prof. Kerley (on the proposed program) and will be about 10 minutes in duration.

In addition, we would like to enquire whether other tertiary research institutions will be represented and, if so, request that each of these also be given opportunity for a short overview of research related to predation management recently completed and/or currently underway.

We humbly suggest that these inputs will set the table so to speak for the proceedings of the Workshop to follow.

Kind regards"

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter JANUARY 2019[1103]:

"Predation workshop to pave the way forward for research and training

The Predation Management Forum (PMF) is planning a workshop to involve role players and stakeholders to develop a framework that will give direction to research and training/extension, which will be practical for all to support and actively participate in. This follows the launch of the Scientific Assessment for Livestock Predation in November last year.

[1103] PMF Newsletter JANUARY 2019; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - Modified - Version 5.0

The workshop will be held on 21 February 2019 in Port Elizabeth and a vast array of tertiary institutions, provincial authorities, predation specialists, hunting associations and producers have been invited to attend.

Dr John Purchase, CEO of AGBIZ, will facilitate the workshop. The theme, "Predation challenges in livestock production: research and development on the way moving forward", is aimed at stimulating discussion and seeking solutions to establish a future research and training structure.

PMF chairman Guillau du Toit will start the workshop by elaborating on the background and stating the needs of the associated industries (red meat, wool, mohair and wildlife). Prof. Graham Kerley from the Nelson Mandela University will present the Scientific Assessment, after which Hugh Campbell from Hortgro Science will present the model that the fruit industry uses for setting research priorities, funding models, stakeholder involvement etc. National Government DAFF and DEA will get an opportunity to brief on the protocol for research priorities.

The aim of the workshop is to develop a framework that will provide all role players, including managers and policymakers, with a coordinated system for predation management."

A preliminary programme for the workshop was circulated by e-mail on 16 February 2019 and the final version of the programme was made available on 21 February 2019[1104].

[1104]

PROGRAMME
PREDATION WORKSHOP: TRAINING AND RESEARCH
Thursday, 21 February 2019 from 09:00 – 18:00
Nelson Mandela University – African Conservation Ecology (ACE)
Room 12-114 on South Campus

Timeslot	Topic of Discussion	Responsible person
09:00–09:05	**Opening and Welcome**	Dr. John Purchase
	Dr. John Purchase, CEO for AGBIZ	
09:05–09:15	**Background and Industry needs**	Guillau du Toit
	Guillau du Toit, Chairman predation Management Forum (PMF)	
09:15–09:45	**Scientific Assessment**	Graham Kerley
	Prof. Graham Kerley, Nelson Mandela University	
09:45–10:05	**Research Model**	Hugh Campbell
	Hugh Campbell, General Manager Hortgro Sciences to elaborate on model that the Fruit Industry use for setting research priorities, funding models, stakeholder involvement etc.	
	Protocol for research priorities – National Government	
10:05–10:15	DEA	Keith Chuma
10:15–10:25	DAFF	Ms. Amanda Shokane (Education & Training)
		Ms. Macucwa Mmaserame (Policy Support)
10:25–10:55	**Tea Break**	
	Tertiary institutions – overview of research relating to predator management	
10:55–11:05	Nelson Mandela University	Graham Kerley
11:05–11:15	University of the Free State	Frikkie Neser (presentation by Quinette Kruger)
11:15–11:25	UNISA	Haemish Melville
11:25–11:35	University of Cape Town	Justin O'Riain
11:35–11:45	University of Mpumalanga	Liaan Minnie
11:45–11:55	University of Fort Hare	Dr. Craig Tambling
12:00–13:00	Discussion of framework - Facilitator	John Purchase
13:00–13:30	**Finger Lunch**	

Version 5.0 - Uncorrected - Version 5.0

At the Workshop the facilitator informed the attendees that a meeting on training protocols was held the previous day (20 February 2019); therefore, it was necessary to change the original programme of the PMF workshop on 21 February 2019. Mr. Leon de Beer was tasked to present verbal feedback on the outcome of the training meeting, which was held on 20 February 2019.

On 21 February 2019, the PMF informed the UFS of its decision to establish a new legal entity and become the Predation Management South Africa (PMSA), with focused functions and responsibilities, namely training, legislation and communication. The PMSA thanked the UFS for its input to address fragmentation and other goals of predation management and hoped it would continue providing information for the PMF newsletter.

After reviewing the proceedings of the workshop on 21 February 2019 and the expectation that a tertiary institution such as the UFS would also have been invited to attend a meeting on training, the UFS inquired about several matters with the PMF. The PMF Chairman replied promptly on 26 February 2019 to Professor Neser, under the heading "***PMF involvement at the PMiC***" (translated excerpt of the Afrikaans letter):

- *The PMF thanked the University of the Free State for the contribution at the predation workshop the previous week.*
- *At the conclusion of the workshop, the PMF Steering Committee discussed the outcomes of the workshop, determined priorities and considered option for the way forward.*
- *After considering the annual report of the PMiC, the RPO informed the meeting that the contract with the UFS will be ended and SAMGA made a similar announcement. The PMF accept and is confident that some functions of the PMiC are valuable and can be used to the benefit of the UFS as a tertiary institution.*
- *As you may be aware, the PMF has been considering a while to found a legal entity and a new constitution has been approved at the meeting of the PMF Steering Committee. The forum will be known as Predation Management South Africa (PMSA), an entity in its own right with purposeful functions and responsibilities, which will focus on training, legislation and communication. A press release will soon be forthcoming.*
- *The PMF is thanking the UFS for their structure, which address fragmentation and other goals of predation management. We asked you cordially not to neglect and provide the PMF newsletter with information.*
- *I want to inform you that the training session which preceded the workshop was not organised by the PMF Secretariat, but it was an action by the DEA and their provincial authorities."*

On 27 February 2019, Mr. Guillau du Toit, Chairman of the PMF issued a "Media Release"; it was also posted on the PMF website on 11 March 2019:

"***Workshop paves way to appoint manager for predation***

Mar 11, 2019

13:30–15:00	**Group Discussions**	
	Research – Facilitator = John Purchase	John Purchase
	Training – Facilitator = DAFF	Abram Shiya
15:00–15:30	**Coffee break**	
15:00–15:30	Feedback by respective groupings	
15:00–15:30	**Discussion**	
15:00–15:30	**Summary and Way forward**	

Version 5.0 - Leo de Waal - Version 5.0

The Predation Management Forum (PMF) held a workshop on 21 February at NMU to develop a framework that will give direction to research and training / extension, which will be practical for all to support and actively engage and participate in. The event was well attended by tertiary institutions, predation specialists, national departments of government (DEA & DAFF) as well as provincial conservation authorities.

After being briefed on research projects conducted on predation management by tertiary institutions such as Nelson Mandela University, UNISA and Universities of Free State, Cape Town, Mpumalanga and Fort Hare, the facilitator, Dr John Purchase from AgBiz was extremely concerned by the evidence that predation losses are increasing!!

Mr. Hugh Campbell, General Manager for Hortgro Science elaborated on the research model that the Fruit industry use for setting priorities, funding models, stakeholder involvement etc. as an example to be considered for predation research. He concluded by saying that the organization is grower focused, expert based, addressing current and anticipating future challenges and that all the processes begins and ends with good communication. Sound communication to all stakeholders, including policymakers, was strongly supported throughout the workshop.

What is essentially required is a formalized structure that will address the gaps identified by producers, researchers (from the Scientific Assessment) and Government. These gaps should ultimately address environmental-, societal- and economic needs.

The steering committee of the PMF met the following day, where the recommendations and outcomes of the workshop were deliberated. A new constitution was adopted, paving the way for the forum to be registered as a legal entity.

Although each industry has its own structure in place to evaluate the merits of research projects, Prof. Graham Kerley of Nelson Mandela University has been tasked to summarise the knowledge gaps as already identified in the Scientific Assessment for Livestock predation and its management in South Africa.

Considering the new constitution and capacity within the new structure, the necessity for the appointment of a manager has become a priority. Responsibilities of such a position will include communication, training and policy issues.

PMF chairman, Guillau du Toit is confident that the appointment of a dedicated person is an absolute necessity to communicate essential elements such as research, policy and training to stakeholders, policy makers and producers. The findings of the Scientific Assessment, aimed at improved approaches for reducing livestock predation, while at the same time contributing to the conservation of our natural predators, will form the basis of a communication strategy for the new appointment.

Contact Leon de Beer, PMF Secretariat [telephone] for further information."

In retrospect, these important announcements by the PMF on 26 February (letter to UFS) and 27 (press release) February 2019 did not come as a surprise. A separate initiative, parallel and concurrent to mainstream developments conducted at successive meetings of the PMF, has been in progress since early 2010. At its meeting[1105], the Management Committee of the Livestock & Wildlife Industry Working Group on DCA (later renamed as the PMF) endorsed the initiative of a 4-person visit to the Federal Wildlife Services USDA-APHIS in May 2010[1106] and nominated a person to represent the PMF. The *"Concept framework for a cooperative Stock Predation Research Programme in South Africa*" originating from the Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University was also briefly discussed. On 27 July 2010, the so-called "Predation Research Management Committee" that convened at the NWGA Head Office in Port Elizabeth

[1105] Minutes - Management Committee of the Livestock & Wildlife Industry Working Group on DCA, 20 April 2010, Bloemfontein.

[1106] On 15 May 2010 a 4-person group, comprising Mrs. Magdel Boshoff (DEAT), Mr. Coligny Stegmann (PMF/SAMGA), Dr. Nico Avenant (National Museum, Bloemfontein) and Prof. HO de Waal (ALPRU/UFS) departed at the invitation of the Federal Wildlife Services, USDA/APHIS on a visit (17-28 May 2010).

discussed matters pertaining to the CRP (Co-operative Research Programme). In retrospect, it seems the envisaged CRP contained primordial but important aspects, which over time evolved in the PredSA. Ostensibly, the outcome of the PMF Workshop of 21 February 2019, specifically the decision by the PMF Steering Committee on 22 February 2019 to appoint a "dedicated person", served only as conduit to formalise a foregone conclusion, which have been planned all along.

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter FEBRUARY 2019[1107]:

*"**Workshop paves way to appoint manager for predation***

Guillau du Toit, chairman for the Predation Management Forum (PMF) released a media statement where he elaborated on a successful predation workshop. The aim was to develop a framework that will give direction to research and training/extension, which will be practical for all to support and actively engage and participate in.

The workshop, an initiative of the PMF and held at the Nelson Mandela University, Port Elizabeth, was well attended by tertiary institutions, predation specialists, national departments of government (DEA and DAFF) as well as provincial conservation authorities.

After being briefed on research projects conducted on predation management by tertiary institutions such as the Universities of Free State, Cape Town, Mpumalanga and Fort Hare, the Nelson Mandela University and UNISA, the facilitator, Dr John Purchase from AgBiz, was extremely concerned about the evidence that predation losses are increasing.

Hugh Campbell, General Manager for Hortgro Science, elaborated on the research model that the fruit industry uses for setting priorities, funding models, stakeholder involvement etc. as an example to be considered for predation research. He concluded by saying that the organisation is grower-focused and expert-based, addressing current and future challenges, and that all the processes begin and end with good communication. Sound communication with all stakeholders, including policymakers, was emphasised throughout the workshop.

What is essentially required is a formalised structure that will address the gaps in policy identified by producers, researchers (from the Scientific Assessment) and Government. New policy should ultimately address these environmental, societal and economic needs.

The steering committee of the PMF met the following day, where the recommendations and outcomes of the workshop were deliberated. A new constitution was adopted, paving the way for the forum to be registered as a legal entity.

Although each industry has its own structure in place to evaluate the merits of research projects, Prof. Graham Kerley of the Nelson Mandela University has been tasked to summarise the knowledge gaps as already identified in the Livestock Predation and its Management in South Africa: A Scientific Assessment (PredSA).

Considering the new constitution and capacity within the new structure, the necessity for the appointment of a manager has become a priority. Responsibilities of such a position will include communication, training and policy issues.

PMF chairman, Guillau du Toit, is adamant that the appointment of a dedicated person is an absolute necessity to communicate essential elements such as research, policy and training to stakeholders, policymakers and producers. The findings of the Scientific Assessment, aimed at improved approaches for reducing livestock predation, while at the same time contributing to the conservation of our natural predators, will form the basis of a communication strategy for the new appointment."

[1107] PMF Newsletter FEBRUARY 2019; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter MARCH 2019[1108]:

*"**Viljoen's annual report echoes scientific assessment that there is no single "silver bullet" for predation management***

According to the 2018 report by Niël Viljoen and his assessment of monitor farms the past 11 years, the most important lesson learnt is that no single management strategy is fool-proof. The secret lies within a combination of management strategies and more importantly, the understanding that these strategies should be altered to prevent predators from adapting to one specific approach. Another key factor is that each livestock producer must fully understand the biology and behaviour patterns of predators that are to be dealt with.

The results of Viljoen's evaluation show significant success and hope for farmers in managing livestock losses. During 2008 when the first monitor farms were established, losses of 2 311 were recorded and the most recent figures for 2018 were down to 828 animals. These results did come at a price as the number of predators that had to be eliminated increased from 242 in 2008 to 526 in 2018. As this surely does not mean that all predators need to be removed from nature, it is important to understand that if predation among livestock reaches a certain level, some unwanted predators will need to be eliminated.

The black-backed jackal, mainly a scavenger, is responsible for 68% of losses (Fig. 22). The preferred prey base in this case is smaller types of lambs up to 30 kg. The caracal, a bigger predator that does not like to scavenge, will go for a bigger prey base, mostly heavier than 30 kg, like lambs that have already been weaned and fully grown ewes.

Predation management aims to reduce livestock losses but comes at a cost.

[1108] PMF Newsletter MARCH 2019; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Fig. 25 gives a clear indication of the success of the programme, showing the annual number of livestock losses on the graph. Indicated on the same graph is the actual number of predators, together with black-backed jackal and caracal eliminated over the same period.

Fig. 26 shows the annual livestock losses due to predation on all monitor farms.

Version 5.0 - Version 5.0

The final results of the monitored farms and the livestock predation management programme are clearly visible on the graph below (Fig. 28). Losses due to predation are manageable, but to achieve this goal some predators have to be eliminated.

Another source of serious concern is the increase in population of predators, especially the black-backed jackal, due to the following factors:

- *Changing environment of commercial agriculture*
- *Smaller livestock units are decreasing and being integrated into larger livestock farms*
- *Traditional livestock farms are converted into game farms and mining areas*
- *Government-owned land projects such as land reform, lead to more areas where predators are not properly managed*
- *The absence of apex predators such as lion and hyena*

The annual report concludes with a clear message from Viljoen that it has become critical to manage and control problems on the farm and to implement a sound livestock predation management programme, which is unavoidable."

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter APRIL 2019[1109]:

"Positive international perspective on PredSA

[1109] PMF Newsletter APRIL 2019; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Livestock Predation and its management in South Africa: A Scientific Assessment received a positive book review by Dr Peter Fleming from Australia. This independent international perspective is about to be published in the African Journal of Wildlife Research.

Fleming's review is positive, and critically identifies some important areas for consideration. It further highlights the value of the governance process that guided PredSA.

'Livestock Predation and its Management in South Africa: a Scientific Assessment by G.I.H. Kerley, S.L. Wilson & D. Balfour (Eds). Centre for African Conservation Ecology, Nelson Mandela University, Port Elizabeth. 2018. Pp. 270, incl.: Foreword, Author Biosketches, Preface, Summary for Policymakers, 9 Chapters and Glossary. ISBN 978-0-620-78763-5 (print), 978-0-620-78764-2 (e-book).

South African predators are sexy, but, like sex, not uniformly experienced by stakeholders. Therein lies the rub: predators hold simultaneously various values, ranging from intrinsically valuable and environmentally beneficial to experientially detrimental and costly for humans that co-occur with them. So, how does South African society deal with this conundrum?

In a major and successful undertaking, Kerley et al. (2018, hereafter 'the Assessment') have defined livestock predation by South Africa's canid and felid predators, focussing particularly on the main predators, black-backed jackals and caracals. The Assessment provides a framework, progressing through the impetus and need for such a study, and why a scientific assessment is necessary. Their scientific assessment is thorough, logically sequenced and accessible by wildlife scientists and managers, policy-makers, other southern African stakeholders and researchers interested in livestock predation in other countries.

Essentially, the Assessment can provide evidence to help assuage the conflict livestock predation causes between people with different world views, values, attitudes, beliefs and ethics. The Assessment unashamedly takes a dispassionate approach to a topic that excites passionate discourse among people with different motivations and experiences. To ensure and demonstrate transparency, a governance oversight process is embraced and outlined: an external committee is surely unique for such a multi-peer reviewed work. Author affiliations and experience are recorded to ensure there are no conflicts of interest or opacity of backgrounds.

Predation of livestock by native and introduced wildlife brings them into conflict with livestock producers. This conflict requires management that accounts for the different values placed on predators. The first step in scientifically addressing any wildlife management issue in an adaptive management framework is to define the problem. What is the predation problem; which animals cause it; which livestock are affected; why does it happen; when, where and how often does it occur; how much does it cost; who has it; who doesn't have it; what can be done about it; what is the legislative and policy framework; what are the ethical considerations of management action and inaction? Answers to these and like questions provide the evidence upon which rational and emotionally intelligent management decisions can be made. The Assessment does this almost exhaustively, and well.

The Summary for Policymakers is an important component, yielding a descriptive, pragmatic and practical overview for stakeholders who are assumed to be, 'intelligent, but not necessarily technical experts'. Technical experts too will gain much from the Assessment. The Summary defines the intellectual framework, governance and process that were undertaken and introduces the layout. It also describes the adaptive management approach, which allows iterative improvements and facilitates progress in the management of human–wildlife conflict associated with livestock predation. I would have placed Box 6.4, which succinctly describes the weighting that can be placed on

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

different sources of information, in the Summary where it is more likely to be read by time-poor policymakers who have to weigh often-contradicting evidence when making decisions about predator management.

The structure of the Assessment leads the reader logically through the review process (Chapter 1); historical (Ch.2) and production (Ch.3) contexts; the socio-economic impacts and their management (Ch.3); the ethical (Ch.4) and legislative (Ch.5) scaffolds supporting management; details of past and current management tools and strategies (Ch.6); biological and ecological case studies of the most contentious mesopredators of livestock (Ch. 7 & 8); and a more general review of the other southern African wildlife species implicated in livestock predation (Ch.9).Of these, Ch.6 is very ambitious, but achieves its objectives: the referencing is extensive; Box 6.1 describes a novel use of virtual fencing to exclude baboons, control of which must surely be a daunting prospect; Table 6.1 is a useful and well-structured summary of current usage of control tools in South Africa …..' "

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMF Newsletter APRIL 2019[1110]:

- **Is predation under control or running wild?**
- Producers can share with the PMF Secretariat their experiences regarding a decrease or an escalation in losses. Contact Bonita Francis at 041 365 5030 or nwga@nwga.co.za

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter MAY 2019[1111]:

*"**Dissecting the Scientific Assessment***

Over the next few months, the nine chapters of the Livestock Predation and its Management in South Africa: A Scientific Assessment will be addressed and concluding remarks by the lead and contributing authors will be highlighted.

CHAPTER 1

Introduction – the need for, and value of a scientific assessment of livestock predation in SA

For two millennia, attempts have been made to prevent predation on livestock, but the problem is still with us. The arrival of domestic livestock in southern Africa about 2 000 years ago would have initiated a then novel form of human–wildlife conflict, driven by the killing of livestock by indigenous predators, and attempts by pastoralists to protect their livestock.

The way forward

PredSA is a significant step forward for the South African agricultural industry to address the conflicts and costs of livestock predation. We know of no precedent worldwide. Replicating this approach in other nations will represent a powerful approach to reduce global levels of conflict between predators and livestock owners.

This document represents a compilation by a group of experts of what we know and what we don't know and, to some extent, what we need to know about livestock predation. It is compiled by experts, largely for an informed audience. The material contained in this assessment is aimed at both livestock managers and those with an interest in biodiversity management in South Africa, as well as policy makers. Given the cultural and linguistic diversity of livestock managers in South Africa, this document, although currently only available in English, should also be made available in multiple languages. The opportunity also exists to communicate the information in the form of "extension documents" that can be made available to livestock managers, extension officers and other stakeholders. The power of modern multimedia (video and audio) can also be harnessed to make the information more broadly available.

[1110] PMF Newsletter APRIL 2019; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[1111] PMF Newsletter MAY 2019; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - Lindi de Waal - Version 5.0

The PredSA assessment should not be seen as the final step in addressing this issue. By their very nature, scientific assessments are living processes, and should catalyse the further generation of knowledge, whether through stimulation of strategic research initiatives (e.g. research on livestock predation in communal areas) or lessons learnt from adaptive management. This will by definition make it necessary to revise and update scientific assessments on a regular basis, as is done for the climate and biodiversity/ecosystem services assessments. In this respect, the record of the process in developing the PredSA assessment allows for the process to be replicated by future generations of assessment practitioners. This document provides the foundation for ongoing learning that will hopefully reduce conflict around livestock predation in South Africa.

Scientific Assessment link

The single document Livestock Predation and its management in South Africa: A Scientific Assessment, containing detailed and current insight and knowledge into the complex situation of predation management, is available on the PMF website.

Click here to view and download the publication. https://predsa.mandela.ac.za/Scientific-Assessment-Publication"

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMF Newsletter MAY 2019[1112]:

- **Predation management manual**
- The manual is a guide to assist producers to manage predator problems on farms, as well the best method within the framework of the provincial and national government and is available at member organisations of the Predation Management Forum (PMF), namely the National Wool Growers' Association of South Africa (NWGA), the Red Meat Producers' Organisation (RPO), the South African Mohair Growers' Association (SAMGA) and Wildlife Ranching SA (WRSA). Contact Bonita Francis, PMF Secretariat at 041 365 5030 or nwga@nwga.co.za for enquiries.
- The manual is also electronically available at the PMF website. https://www.pmfsa.co.za/images/news/Manual_Afrikaans.pdf

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter MAY 2019[1113]:

*"**Predation info leaflets at PMiC***

In response to requests from farmers regarding specific topics relating to predation and predation management, the Predation Management Centre is expanding its series of information leaflets. The leaflets are compiled from various scientific publications and transcripts.

The first series covers the predator species involved in human–predator conflicts. The first leaflet distributed comprised general information on the black-backed jackal.

The next few leaflets will concentrate on how various factors influence predation by black-backed jackals as well as the management of black-backed jackals. Topics will include the following:

- *Reproduction*
- *Feeding ecology*
- *Management*
- *Interactions with other predator species*
- *Social organisation*

Once work on the new Predation Management Centre website has been completed, the information leaflets will be made available on the website and the link will be available

[1112] PMF Newsletter MAY 2019; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[1113] PMF Newsletter MAY 2019; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

shortly. Short summaries of the leaflets will be supplied through the PMF newsletter as they are made available on the website."

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMF Newsletter MAY 2019[1114]:

- **Eastern Cape farmers and farm workers learn about predation**
- More than 70 farmers and farm workers recently benefited from the 'vermin' courses that Niël Viljoen, predation specialist presented in the Eastern Cape.
- The courses started on the farm of Richard Biggs in the Camdeboo district near Graaff-Reinet and drew more than 25 farm workers. To everybody's great surprise one farmer worker boasted with photographs of a caracal and black-backed jackal, which were caught the following day.
- The Noupoort district used the opportunity to benefit from Viljoen's knowledge and the farm workers of Kobie van der Walt perspired when Viljoen inspected their equipment bags and foothold traps. He also demonstrated practically how to set a foothold trap.
- The courses ended in Britstown on the farm of Zachi Blomerus. There was great appreciation for the effort of the NWGA to empower wool farmers in the use of effective methods to control problem animals and thus farm more economically.

The 51st Congress of the South African Society for Animal Science on 11 June 2019 was held from 10-12 June 2019 at the University of the Free State in Bloemfontein. A Predation Workshop was included in the programme and four co-workers of ALPRU were invited for their input, namely Dr. Nico Avenant[1115] (National Museum, Bloemfontein), Mr. Andries Strauss[1116] (Free State Department of Agriculture and Rural Development, Glen), Me. Quinette Kruger[1117] (PMC, UFS) and Prof. HO de Waal[1118] (PMC, UFS).

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMF Newsletter JUNE 2019[1119]:

- **Predation forms part of the NWGA's chairman's report**
- The previous week at the 90th Annual NWGA Congress, the Chairman Guillau du Toit reported on the year's activities and said the following about predation:
- "*The past 90 years this organisation speaks about predation and will continue doing such for the next 90 years, because predation is part of nature and requires to be managed at the same level as our sheep flocks. Environment, climate, farming circumstances and control methods change continuously*."
- The past few years the PMF was at a crossroad with several side roads and options.
- The completion of the Scientific Assessment followed by a successful workshop for all stakeholders[1120], made decision making easier. The Action Committee of the PMF started the following processes:
  - Stop financing the Predation Management Information Centre (PMiC), because a broader vision is envisaged that will more value for money to assist producers at farm level
  - Registration of the PMF as a legal entity with the name Predation Management South Africa (PMSA)
  - Focus on future training, communication and correction of the Norms and Standards, as well as legislation
  - Appointment of a manager to drive the new focus points

[1114] PMF Newsletter MAY 2019; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[1115] Feeding ecology of caracal and black-backed jackal in livestock areas – implications for predation management.
[1116] Predation management on a sheep farm in the central Free State Province, South Africa.
[1117] Human-wildlife conflict and the importance of information in managing predation.
[1118] The need for coordinated predation management in South Africa – quo vadis?
[1119] PMF Newsletter JUNE 2019; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[1120] Editor's Note: In retrospect, it seems the attendance of the workshop was not for all stakeholders, but by invitation only.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMF Newsletter JUNE 2019[1121]:

- **Predation management rather than predator management**
- At the NWGA Annual Congress in Port Elizabeth, predation specialist Niël Viljoen shared his knowledge and experience over the past 11 years and involvement at 27 monitor farms countrywide with delegates. He referred to the toolbox with control method and although he had confidence in most methods, identified jackals-proof fences, kraaling and call-and-shoot as the three best methods.
- According to Viljoen, the success of a control method is not measured in the number of predators killed, but by the guaranteed continuous growth in weaning percentage.
- He also holds the view that the success of a control method is determined by good planning, followed by continuously applying good management, risk management and landowners dedicated towards predation management rather than predator management.
- TRAINING
- The past 11 years, Viljoen presented 244 courses with an attendance of more than 10 200 farmers and workers. The obvious goal with the training is to disseminate knowledge, provide support to farmers, expose and convince those not yet using the toolbox of the advantages and convert them. Control methods must be investigated, understood and used.

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter JUNE 2019[1122]:

*"**Predation management workshop, SASAS Congress 2019***

On 11 June 2019, a predation workshop was held as one of the sessions of the 51st congress of the South African Society for Animal Science (SASAS) at the University of the Free State.

Topics covered were:

- Feeding ecology of caracal and black-backed jackal in livestock areas – implications for predation management – Dr N Avenant

- Predation management on a sheep farm in the central Free State Province, South Africa – Andries Strauss

- Human–wildlife conflict and the importance of information in managing predation – Quinette Kruger

- The need for coordinated predation management in South Africa – quo vadis? – Prof. HO de Waal

The presentations in the session highlighted the value of information to inform predation management strategies. It also stressed the need for information and cooperation among stakeholders to reduce the impact of predation on livestock production in the face of growing challenges."

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter JULY 2019[1123]:

*"**Dissecting the Scientific Assessment***

Over the next few months, the nine chapters of the Scientific Assessment will be addressed and concluding remarks by the lead authors and other contributing authors will be highlighted.

CHAPTER 2

History of predator–livestock conflict in South Africa

This chapter provides a historical account of the longer-term predator–livestock interaction within what is now the Republic of South Africa, against an abbreviated summary of socio-political and economical changes. The arrangement is chronological

[1121] PMF Newsletter JUNE 2019; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[1122] PMF Newsletter JUNE 2019; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[1123] PMF Newsletter JULY 2019; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

and the methodology is that of the humanities and social sciences, by utilising existing primary and secondary sources to construct a coherent, explanatory narrative. This is an assessment of currently available published knowledge, which has its limitations, and the authors did not conduct in-depth primary archival and other research for this purpose.

Conclusion

The above outline of the history of the management of predation on livestock has highlighted how uneven and complex this matter has been and still is. This is so, whether the issue is considered

• ecologically (in terms of various parts of South Africa);

• regionally, racially and economically (in terms of its impact on different farmers and communities);

• philosophically (in terms of societal attitudes towards predators/vermin); or

• politically (mashing national and provincial structures over the long history of the subcontinent).

What emerges is that whatever methods are applied to curb or halt the onslaught on small stock by jackal and caracal over the past 350 years, these have proved ineffective over the long term. This is true even though there were periods in which management was more successful than others in certain regions.

Moreover, in a global context of volatile wool and meat prices, an ever-changing national context in which agriculture has a declining share of GDP, and burgeoning urbanisation, the future policy environment is also bound to be complex. In addition, as explained by Nattrass et al. (2017b), and the chapters that follow, formal scientific knowledge of mesopredators is far from extensive and many of these species are elusive and highly adaptable. Policymaking at a national level under these circumstances is bound to be difficult. The central issue in the Assessment is whether the state has an obligation to protect livestock farmers in South Africa from certain species of predators. Providing regulations for a specific section of the population that farms with sheep in order to protect livestock from errant individual large fauna, such as elephant or lion escaping from protected areas, is very difficult.

Scientific Assessment link

Livestock Predation and its management in South Africa: A Scientific Assessment contains detailed and current insight into, and knowledge about the complex situation of predation management, and is available on the PMF website.

Click here to view and download the publication.

https://predsa.mandela.ac.za/Scientific-Assessment-Publication"

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter JULY 2019[1124]:

*"**Get to know your predators***

The website of the Predation Management Information Centre (PMiC) https://www.ufs.ac.za/pmic is a source of information about predators. An information leaflet was compiled about the black-backed jackal, which is one of the most successful predators in South Africa, and is able to adapt to different environments and circumstances.

Click on the link https://bit.ly/2XR7rAr where you will find "Feeding ecology of black-backed jackal", which focuses on this animal's ability to adapt its diet to different situations. It contains information sourced from various studies conducted in South Africa on the diet and feeding behaviour of this species."

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter JULY 2019[1125]:

[1124] PMF Newsletter JULY 2019; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[1125] PMF Newsletter JULY 2019; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 – HO Draft Version 5.0

*"**SOUND ADVICE***

'Good planning, followed by good management that is consistently practiced alleviates risk management and those land owners who are focused on predation management rather than predator management, will find success in the control method.', says Niel Viljoen, Predation Management Specialist."

The process to register the Predation Management South Africa (PMSA), a legal entity with specific functions and responsibilities that will focus on training, legislation and communication, took some time to be finalised. However, in August 2019, the PMF Secretariat announced that the PMSA was registered as a non-profit organisation.

The first meeting of the PMSA Forum was held on Friday 23 August 2019 in the Board Room, Landbougebou, UFS, Bloemfontein. Excerpts of the minutes are quoted below:

*"Present: **NWGA** - Guillau du Toit (National Chairman), Leon de Beer (GM), JR Schlebusch (NC), Thomas Barry (WC), Machiel Odendaal (MP), Anton Marx (Free State), Hendrik Botha (KZN), **SA Mohair Growers' Assoc**. - Coligny Stegmann, **Wildlife Ranching SA** - Johan Serfontein, **RPO** - Willie Clack (Large Stock Industry), Jack van Eeden (Free State), Carine Annandale (Free State), Dirk Krapohl (Northern Cape), Johannes Human (Northern Cape), Pearson Laubscher, Hendrik Botha (KZN), **ALPRU / UFS** - HO De Waal, **PMiC** - Quinette Kruger, **Researcher** - Niël Viljoen, **DAFF** - Victor Musetha, **Environmental Affairs** - Magdel Boshoff, Tim de Jongh (EC), Gerrie Ferreira (EC), Jaco van Deventer (CapeNature), **Free State Hunting Association** - Daan Bodenstein, **PMF Secretariat** - Bonita Francis. Apologies: Gerhard Schutte (RPO Small stock industry), Adri Kitshoff-Botha (WRSA), Niel du Preez (NWGA EC), Frikkie Wentzel (RPO EC), Sakkie van Zyl (RPO North West), Thys de Wet (Scientist), Wayne Munger (KZN Environment), David Paulse (NC Environment), Anton van Wetten (Limpopo Environment), Lourens Goosen (Free State Environment), Dorothy Makaringe (Mpumalanga Environment), Leon Lotter (Gauteng Environment), Moeti Phala (North West Environment).*

1. OPENING AND WELCOME

Willie Clack opened the meeting with scripture reading and prayer. Clack was introduced to the Forum as the newly elected vice chairman. Members were welcomed and new faces were introduced to the rest of the forum.

2. APOLOGIES

See above

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the previous meeting held on 6 September 2018 at the University of Free State, Bloemfontein was approved with no changes on the proposal of Hendrik Botha and seconded by Tim de Jongh.

The Chairman gave a thorough rundown on all the actions over the past few years.

4. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

5 MATTERS FOR DISCUSSION

5.1 Predation Workshop – the way forward

5.1.1 Outcome of the Predation workshop

5.1.1.1 New structure

Leon de Beer reported that the Predation workshop held in February 2019, was successful and the necessity for PMF to become a legal entity, accentuated. Registration process started mid-March and PMF Secretariat was informed on 6 August that structure

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

was officially registered as NPO with new name "Predation Management South Africa" (PMSA).

5.1.1.2 Appointment of Manager for Predation

PMSA Executive Committee changed their decision of appointing a manager based on the availability of funds and the affordability of such a position and opted to rather utilize funding for an executive chairman and creating administrative capacity to assist. They will be in a better position to communicate with policy makers who will advise on legislation and communicate with provincial structures.

5.1.1.3 Research gaps and priorities for the management of livestock predation in SA

Leon de Beer referred to document by Prof. Graham Kerley addressing the research gaps and priorities as identified through the Scientific Assessment. These chapters will now be prioritized in terms of what the producer on grass-roots level requires. PMSA will advise those industries who have research structures in place (CWSA & RMRDT) of the priorities.

As DEA is a regulatory member of PMSA, the chairman confirmed that they would be entitled to give input to research priorities, should they see possibility of financially contributing to research.

5.1.1.4 Budget

Meeting was informed of budget of R100 000 per annum for operational expenses of executive chairman and administrative capacity and that each industry will have to contribute R25 000. This can only apply from 2020 financial year, as some industries have not budgeted for the expense. However, PMSA acknowledged with thanks the generosity of RPO and their willingness to stand in for WRSA and SAMGA to implement the new budget immediately.

Leon de Beer confirmed that Niel Viljoen's predation programme will continue under the management of PMSA and that statutory funding will be part of the budget.

5.1.1.4.1 SAMGA

The meeting took cognizance of a letter from SAMGA whereby they request a listing of direct benefits to consider future membership of PMSA. The Chairman felt it difficult to reply in writing and is of the opinion that he will personally convey to the SAMGA Board what PMSA has achieved over the years.

5.1.1.5 Follow up workshop

The Predation workshop held in February 2019 was based on research and training, with the intention of holding a second workshop focusing on legislation. With current developments, PMSA decided to follow the route of one-on-one meetings with senior management of DAFF and DEA to influence legislation. ***Forum expressed satisfaction with the decision of Executive committee.***

5.2 Predation Management Information Centre

The meeting took cognizance of letter to Prof. Frikkie Neser, University of Free State regarding the PMF's involvement with PMiC.

Prof. HO De Waal reiterated that the PMC at the UFS is still operational and this initiative to establish a system of coordinated predation management in South Africa will be strengthened. Some clarity is needed on recent events, therefore it is important to note the following:

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

- *ALPRU is focusing on large African predators and since 2004, the Canis-Caracal Programme (CCP) is specifically interested in the black-backed jackal and caracal.*
- *Postgraduate studies have been concluded (or is in the process of being submitted), namely Gunter (2008 - Historical data on two damage causing predators), Strauss (2009 - Impact of predation on a sheep enterprise), Van Niekerk (2010 - Predation on small livestock), Du Plessis (2013 - Developing a sustainable management strategy), Badenhorst (2014 - Cost of large stock predation), Schepers (2016 - Economic implications of predation on wildlife) and Kruger (2019 – Developing a Management Information System - MIS).*
- *Moral and financial support by the RPO, NWGA, SAMGA and WRSA for these studies are acknowledged and appreciated.*
- *Funding was requested from the RMRD SA to study the impact of predation on wildlife. This request (R150 000), as well as requests by other institutions, was "signed off" by the PMF Steering Committee [PFM Minutes 28 Augusts 2013, paragraph 6.1].*
- *Release of the funding was delayed; therefore, ALPRU had to advance the funds to enable urgent preparatory work by the postgraduate and start the study during 2014.*
- *The money was still with the NWGA and it was arranged to have it disbursed to the UFS.*
- *In early 2015 the RMRD SA, NWGA and UFS signed a joint Agreement (with an attached Protocol) and a first tranche of 80% was paid to the UFS.*
- *The study was concluded during 2016 and all requirements were met as stipulated in the Agreement (and the Protocol), as well as complying with the RMRD SA's check list.*
- *Despite repeated submissions of an UFS tax invoice to the NWGA for payment, the final amount was still outstanding on 22 August 2019.*

As the PMSA cannot make decisions on the outcomes of research within the RMRD and they have their own protocol, Prof. De Waal to take the matter up directly with RMRD.

5.3 Norms and Standards

Magdel Boshoff referred to initial indication that process would be finalized by March 2019, but as this is not the case and it is the intention of DEA to submit for approval process in January 2020, the procedure must conclude by the end of March 2020. She is however sceptical to recommend that Norms and Standard to be implemented based on the following:

1) DEA lost a lawsuit against the National Council of Societies for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (NSPCA) recently emanating public perceptions and relevance of animal welfare.

2) Public perceptions have become very relevant and cannot be ignored.

3) Pressure on DEA to consider and take into account the welfare issues perceived by the public.

4) Scientific Assessment and the key knowledge gaps that were identified. From a legislative viewpoint, it will be difficult to manage as some control methods are considered inhumane (such as denning, gin traps etc.). With reference to the control methods in the N&S, most of the public commentary received related to inhumane methods.

5) If the N&S are implemented, it will become enforceable and have many legal challenges for DEA. If it becomes legislation, there will be more consciousness over control methods which could be contentious.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

Boshoff suggested proceeding with the process of implementation, but not as Norms and Standards, rather as guidelines, which is not enforceable and cannot be challenged in court. Exposure of the document will be less obvious as opposed to it being published in a government gazette. The meeting discussed the recommendation and found that the implementation as guidelines rather than N&S to be the best solution in the interest of the farmer.

5.4 Poison getters

Magdel Boshoff referred to the Permit & Enforcement Planning committee meeting where none of the provinces were against the principle of using getters and the fact that Johan Strydom conducts the training. His training manual was made available but as some provinces requires an English version, Prof. HO De Waal was requested to translate the document. Once the document has been signed off and approved by die provinces, the necessary training and issuing of permits can be conducted. Method has already been included in the Norms and Standards and is most suitable for management of stray dogs.

Taking the PETA-video in the mohair industry into consideration, Leon de Beer referred to the challenge of funding predation research associated with poison and encouraged other commodities besides mohair and wool, to do necessary research. As long as the control method is not illegal, it is a tool to be used within the toolbox for predation management.

5.5 National strategy – predators escaping protected areas

Magdel Boshoff strongly doubts if any of the protected areas will fence a reserve to keep jackal in, as it is against conservational objectives and it is the purpose of protected areas. She is leaning more towards the development of a national strategy for predation management but is unsure what a budget for such a strategy would look like and enquired on any possibilities of co-funding, should DEA considers funding. Her recommendation in the meantime is that she does not have an answer for jackal escaping protected areas.

Daan Bodenstein expressed confusion over what needs to be funded, as the Free State Hunters Association is only seeking permission to allow hunters in national and provincial parks to shoot jackal, which is a cost to the farmer.

Jaco van Deventer remarked that Cape Nature is already implementing an effective system in the Western Cape with mutual cooperation and communication with landowners. It is his opinion to stop seeing nature reserves in silos as they manage both landscapes and individuals. It is about communication, attitude and good neighbour ship, therefore not necessary to kill more animals, but to do proper management.

Tim de Jongh referred to a successful method that he used when he was a reserve manager whereby they would allow a "hot pursuit." It is his suggestion that provincial- and national parks be approached to allow "hot pursuits". It is further important that provincial predation forums get the names of relevant SANParks and provincial parks officials to serve on the forums.

As each province will deal with the matter in a different way, Magdel Boshoff proposed that information be gathered from parks as to how they deal with the matter, including the successes of WC and EC and that it be made available through PMSA Secretariat.

Decision:

1. *Request procedures from provincial authorities and provide DEA with information.*
2. *DEA to provide national policy to give guidance.*
3. *Provincial PMF's need to take up their responsibility to address issues on provincial level.*

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

4. Free State PMF to address issue with Free State Hunters' Association.
5. Importance of parks officials on provincial forums.
6. Invite SANPARK official to this forum in order to facilitate communication with provincial authorities.

5.6 Stray dogs

The meeting took cognizance of a reply from Ndlambe Municipality where they are of the opinion that the issue of stray dogs should revolve under the SAPS, Farmers' associations, game reserves etc. PMSA is reliant on Collen Rammule, SALGA to assist as municipalities are mandated to implement bylaws.

Tim de Jongh made mention of an attorney that assisted EC Agri with municipal issues. It is further important to get copies of municipal bylaws and force implementation.

5.7 Predation Management Manual – Xhosa translation

The meeting took cognizance that sections from the predation manual relating to Domestic Dogs, combined with a 12-page information booklet received from Niel Viljoen was translated in isi-Xhosa.

5.8 Predation management training (arising)

5.8.1 Adoption and underwriting of accredited course (arising)

Magdel Boshoff referred to agreement by provincial authorities that training provided by Niel Viljoen is the minimum standard that is required for training. There is currently a list of instructors that needs to be updated. In addition, should a new person undergo training, a platform will be created (possibly PMSA Executive) whereby his CV and manual will be scrutinized to access competency. This will create confidence in provinces that person has undergone the necessary training and is competent to use control method. This is of course a requirement in the Norms and Standard that says that person should be adequately trained. Provinces will receive list of instructors.

Leon de Beer referred to current challenge whereby permits to professional hunters are still issued without necessity for accredited training. He suggested a cut off time for training, thereby eliminating any rush to Niel and current accredited service providers (instructors). Tim de Jongh briefly explained how the system is dealt with in the Eastern Cape.

The approach by the PMSA is to create a system whereby farmers can confidently make use of professional managers / hunters, eliminating fly by nights.

The Western Cape welcomed the accreditation process and wants to reach a point where only accredited trainers are issued with permits. However, unless they have that, they cannot refuse permits. Niel Viljoen has been struggling in the WC as everyone is looking at how the system is operated in the Eastern Cape.

5.9 Predation Training Programme

Niel Viljoen presented his journey in discovering how animal behaviour over the past 10 years have changed and how global warming has affected the increase in predation losses. Looking at rainfall figures from 1944 – 2018, he discovered that the drier the years, an increase in predation by black backed jackal occurred whereas other species such as scavengers are favoured by drought conditions. It has come to his attention how rain, wind and temperature play major roles and have direct impact on predation management[1126].

[1126] Editor's Note: Mr. Niël Viljoen's presentation was informative. This information was also shared with farmers, hunters and farm workers that attended courses in his predation training programme. He alluded to changes in animal behaviour over the past 10 years, claiming global warming has affected the increase in predation losses. In the absence of specific detail/results to support Mr. Niël Viljoen's statement, it was challenged from the floor.

Version 5.0 - Working Draft Version 5.0

5.9.1 <u>Peter Schneekluth – 1080 permit</u>

Meeting took note of correspondence contained in the agenda. It needs to be noted that it is illegal to use single dose 1080 to kill animals and although Peter Schneekluth has a license to import the substance, it cannot be used unless it used in a poison collar.

Jaco van Deventer informed the meeting of Cape Nature's efforts to stop Mr. Schneekluth from obtaining any further permits to sell and advertise 1080 in the form of single lethal dose bait.

5.9.2 Provincial reports

5.9.3 Leopard predation in the Eastern Cape

Gerrie Ferreira, East Cape Dept. Environmental Affairs presented a slide show on the current status of leopard management and the challenges they experience in the Eastern Cape. The Northern Cape also expressed problems with leopards and that fencing seems to be the problem.

Jaco van Deventer contributed to the discussion by highlighting the behaviour of leopards and the fact that fencing does not restrict leopards in any way and that a policy of no relocation is accepted when dealing with leopards. In the Western Cape, they seldom remove a leopard because of the cooperation with landowners and mitigation, therefore management of the situation is crucial.

Decision:

Gerrie van der Walt and Jaco van Deventer to discuss the correct procedures to manage leopards in areas of conflict.

5.9.4 Northern Cape Predation project

Pearson Laubscher, professional jackal hunter introduced himself to the meeting and briefly outlined his services and requested cooperation with Niel Viljoen.

5.9.5 Western Cape PMF

Thomas Barry, NWGA representative indicated his intention to activate the WC PMF to address matters of concern.

5.10PMSA Executive Committee

Coligny Stegmann suggested that Niel Viljoen serve on the PMSA Executive committee.

The meeting concluded at 12:30."

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter AUGUST 2019[1127]:

*"**Dissecting the Scientific Assessment***

Over the next few months, the nine chapters of the Scientific Assessment will be addressed and concluding remarks by the lead authors and authors will be highlighted.

CHAPTER 3

The socio-economic impact of livestock predation and its prevention in South Africa

The synthesis of available information on socio-economic issues (Turpie & Babatopie, 2018:53-81) highlights the lack of robust and broadly applicable research undertaken at relevant scales in this discipline.

[1127] PMF Newsletter AUGUST 2019; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - HO deWaal - Version 5.0

"Understanding the economic and social consequences of depredation problems in rangelands has been fraught by a lack of systematically collected data. It is only in recent years that larger scale surveys have been carried out, and that panel studies have been established. Future studies should include

• large-scale, multi-disciplinary, multi-year panel studies (i.e. involving the same farmers) that collect data on farming practices and a range of biophysical and socio-economic variables;

• experimental and behavioural economics studies;

• stated preference studies; and

• social and anthropological studies in order to address the following knowledge gaps:

• Spatio-temporal patterns in predator densities and rates of predation

• The factors driving rates of predation, taking contextual and management factors into account, including the role of natural prey density

• A detailed understanding of the role of private game farms

• The net effect of predators, taking other sources of loss into account (i.e. the counterfactual)

• The factors driving farmers' choice of methods

• The level of investment and ongoing expenditure on different means of dealing with predator problems, and how this varies

• The effect of predation risk on the viability of farming with livestock

• The extent of responses to predation risk (or risk of livestock losses more generally), including changing land use, impact on farming communities, farm income and employment, and the social consequences

• The role of predation risk in changing land-use patterns versus other factors such as market prices, crime and labour legislation

• Societal values and preferences regarding the presence and management of wildlife (generally) and predators (specifically) on rangelands

• The potential effects of alternative policy measures such as incentivising or subsidising non-lethal methods, fencing and eradication, or managing for more natural, free-ranging prey populations

• Identifying measures that would be effective in achieving desirable outcomes from a societal perspective, and the costs and benefits of their implementation."

Scientific Assessment link

Livestock Predation and its management in South Africa: A Scientific Assessment contains detailed and current insight into, and knowledge about the complex situation of predation management, and is available on the PMF website.

Click here to view and download the publication.

https://predsa.mandela.ac.za/Scientific-Assessment-Publication"

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMF Newsletter AUGUST 2019[1128]:

- **Praise for Niël Viljoen**
- Ben Maree, chairman of Marydale Agricultural Association as well as a farmer facing predation challenges, made the following statement regarding Niël Viljoen: "*Please keep this man going among the livestock farmers.*"
- Recently Niël engaged with landowners in an information session at Marydale and the next day presented a practical session for hunters and farmers. The practical session was preceded with necessary theory, including the maintenance and calibration of trapping equipment. Then the attendees could learn the finer aspects of setting of traps and choice of setting sites in the veld. Seasoned hunters was surprised by Niël's knowledge – they were unanimous, this man knew his story and conveys it with passion, understandable and clear.

[1128] PMF Newsletter AUGUST 2019; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

- Niël's knowledge, experience and passion belongs in the livestock industry, and those involved in funding him was thanked sincerely.
- Maree also said that no hunter without having done Niël's course, or something similar, would be allowed on his land.

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter AUGUST 2019[1129]:

*"**Experts share their knowledge***

Recently, some experts in various fields have shared their knowledge about predation management on various platforms.

In this year's special edition of SA Hunter/Kolskoot, a specialist predator hunter shares his knowledge about effective control of damage-causing predators (particularly black-backed jackals). Mr Eugene van Niekerk emphasises the importance of dedication, knowledge of the area and the ecology and behaviour of the predator species in question, and the use of equipment best suited for hunting the black-backed jackal.

In the 16 August 2019 edition of Landbouweekblad, an ecologist shares some of the valuable contributions that science has made to our understanding of the predator species most commonly causing damage on livestock farms. Dr Nico Avenant highlights the value of scientific information to help us better understand the impact of predators (particularly black-backed jackal and caracal) on livestock farming. The interactions between predators and other animals commonly present on livestock farms as well as the behaviour and feeding ecology of these predators need to be studied. Such information is important to manage predation in such a way that it will reduce or limit it in a particular area.

Also be on the lookout for a TV broadcast on 26 August at 21:00 on KykNet (DSTV Channel 144). This episode of Prontuit will deal with the various perceptions surrounding the black-backed jackal. People from various backgrounds are interviewed to share their knowledge, experience and opinions of this extraordinary animal. This includes farmers using different approaches to manage predation, a specialist predator hunter, and a researcher who has studied the complex interactions between humans and the black-backed jackal."

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter SEPTEMBER 2019[1130]:

*"**Predation forum is now a legal entity***

One of the outcomes of the Predation Workshop held in February 2019 in Port Elizabeth was the establishment of a new structure within the predation management forum. The Secretariat was informed by the Department of Social Development that the organisation was officially registered as a non-profit organisation in the name of Predation Management South Africa (PMSA). The next step is the registration of exemption from income tax.

Affiliated members are those organisations that represent the interests of directly affected groups in the livestock and ranching industries. These groups are woolgrowers, red-meat producers, mohair growers and wildlife ranchers. Operational expenses for the forum will be covered from the membership fees of the industries."

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter SEPTEMBER 2019[1131]:

*"**New vice chairman for PMSA***

Mr Willie Clack was unanimously elected as vice chair during the most recent meeting of the PMSA. This was done in accordance with the requirements for the formation of a legal entity. The nomination of Clack is also in keeping with the gentleman's agreement

[1129] PMF Newsletter AUGUST 2019; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[1130] PMF Newsletter SEPTEMBER 2019; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[1131] PMF Newsletter SEPTEMBER 2019; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

that the PMSA Secretariat and chairmanship remain with the NWGA and stock theft falls under the operational management of RPO. Mr Guillau du Toit took over the chairmanship from Mr Harry Prinsloo in August 2016."

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter SEPTEMBER 2019[1132]:

*"**Predation projects***

The importance of Niel Viljoen's predation management project was recognised and will it be managed under the auspices of PMSA. This project will enter its 12th year whereby 27 farms are monitored and farmers play a leading role in the control of predation management. Effective training for everyone involved as well as the implementation of a predation management plan to minimize losses due to predators, is the ultimate goal and the system should be sustainable and cost effective."

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter SEPTEMBER 2019[1133]:

Dissecting the Scientific Assessment

Over the next few months, the nine chapters of Livestock Predation and its management in South Africa: A Scientific Assessment will be addressed and concluding remarks by the lead authors and contributing authors will be highlighted.

CHAPTER 4

Ethical considerations in the management of livestock predation

It may not seem obvious to all that the management of predators has anything to do with ethics. However, a key element of the livestock predation issue is that it entails a conflict of interest between various stakeholders, and wherever it exists, there are ethical implications. Without guidelines or policies for resolving any conflict of interest, conflict of another more harmful kind can easily develop between those with competing interests. The most obvious conflict of interest is that between livestock owners and predators.

a) With losses of livestock due to predation in South Africa estimated at more than a billion rand annually, livestock owners clearly have economic interests they want to protect.

b) Predators have to feed themselves and their young, and avoid injury or disability in order to survive.

Our ethical dilemma consists in deciding on what policies we need to apply in order to ensure a balance between the competing interests.

Responsibility of the state

The state has a responsibility in managing conflict between livestock owners and predators. The current situation in South Africa is such that the responsibility for managing predators largely falls on the shoulders of individual livestock owners. Since there is no coordinated approach or clarity on policy, this needs to be addressed. It is the responsibility of government to mediate between competing interests and to facilitate the formulation of clear, workable policy and even legislative reform, where necessary. In a constitutional state, there is an obligation to ensure that all stakeholders' interests are considered and that solutions are found that are fundamentally fair. The most suitable method of predation management in terms of the social contract may not be practicable without the participation and intervention of the state, and the use of some state resources.

Scientific Assessment link

The single document, Livestock Predation and its management in South Africa: A Scientific Assessment, containing detailed and current insight into and knowledge about the complex situation of predation management, is available on the PMF website.

[1132] PMF Newsletter SEPTEMBER 2019; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[1133] PMF Newsletter SEPTEMBER 2019; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

Click here to view and download the publication.
https://predsa.mandela.ac.za/Scientific-Assessment-Publication"

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter SEPTEMBER 2019[1134]:

*"**Reproduction of the black-backed jackal***

The next leaflet in the Predation Management Information Centre's (PMIC) series covering the black-backed jackal contains information sourced from research on the reproduction of this predator species.

Black-backed jackals breed once a year, during winter. Females may come into heat earlier (May) or later (August) during the mating season, depending on their age, body condition and local environmental conditions. After a pregnancy of 60 to 70 days, females give birth (July to October, depending on habitat and food availability) in underground dens. Pup survival also depends on food availability. Pups are weaned at three to four months of age, which is when they start accompanying adults in search of food. By the age of 6 to 12 months, young jackals can hunt on their own. They usually leave the parents' home range during summer months to establish their own breeding territories.

For more information, read the leaflet here:
https://www.ufs.ac.za/docs/librariesprovider22/pmic-documents/01_02-reproduction-of-jackal. pdf?sfvrsn=1f2b8421_4

Visit their website https://www.ufs.ac.za/pmic or contact them on Tel: +27 51 401 2210 or email: PredationMC@ufs.ac.za"

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter OCTOBER 2019[1135]:

*"**PMSA to influence legislation relating to predation***

As agriculture and biodiversity are both key elements of the South African economy, the roles of both the Departments of Agriculture, Rural Development and Land Reform (DARDLR) and Environmental Affairs (DEA) are important in providing regulatory environments in the management of predation. Agriculture is responsible for the production of goods and services by the livestock industry, and the DEA for the management of the natural environment in a manner that enables growth and development today without limiting the options of future generations.

Predation Management South Africa (PMSA) met with senior management of the DEA last week in Pretoria to seek a way forward with regard to legislation, and specifically norms and standards, which is in the final stages of implementation. This was done as an important outcome of the Scientific Assessment, conducted by Prof Graham Kerley from NMU, where a special chapter was dedicated to provide guidelines to policy makers. They also discussed the involvement of PMSA in legislation and guidelines. Ms Wadzi Mandivenyi, Mr Kiruben Naicker and Ms Magdel Boshoff were of the opinion that PMSA should become a member of the Wildlife Forum of the DEA. It is a consultative forum that looks into national issues with regard to wildlife that need to be addressed by the Minister on a continuous basis. The DEA further undertook to involve the DARDLR in the process.

The DEA was the main sponsor of the Scientific Assessment."

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter OCTOBER 2019[1136]:

*"**Black-Backed Jackal predation – signs and feeding patterns***

The next leaflet in the Predation Management Information Centre's (PMIC's) series covering the black-backed jackal contains information sourced from research conducted on the signs and feeding patterns of this predator species.

[1134] PMF Newsletter SEPTEMBER 2019; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[1135] PMF Newsletter OCTOBER 2019; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[1136] PMF Newsletter OCTOBER 2019; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - Provisional - Version 5.0

It is important to determine the cause of death of your livestock or game to distinguish whether the animal was killed by a predator or died of another cause. A few minor changes in management strategies could significantly reduce losses, whether the losses were due to predation, farm or herd/flock management inadequacies, or disease.

A predator feeding on a carcass may not necessarily be the original predator, but only opportunistically feeding on the carcass. Therefore, examination of the carcass and immediate surroundings can give clues as to whether the carcass was scavenged or killed. Knowing which predator species was responsible for the loss of livestock or game will guide decisions on which course of action to take to manage predation on a property.

For more information on the topic, read the leaflet here:

https://www.ufs.ac.za/docs/librariesprovider22/pmic-documents/01_08-predation-by-black-backed-jackal.pdf?sfvrsn=923b8121_6

Visit the PMIC website https://www.ufs.ac.za/pmic or contact them on +27 51 401 2210 or email PredationMC@ufs.ac.za."

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter OCTOBER 2019[1137]:

*"**Dissecting the Scientific Assessment***

Over the next few months, the nine chapters of the Scientific Assessment will be addressed and concluding remarks by the lead authors and authors will be highlighted.

CHAPTER 5

Legal considerations in the management of livestock predation

Losses to livestock caused by predators affect both commercial farmers carrying large numbers of livestock and small-scale and subsistence livestock farmers on communal land. This can pose a significant challenge to the economic survival of many new and emerging farmers or could ultimately result in fewer people choosing to farm with livestock. Chapter 5 outlines the rights of landowners to eliminate or control predators that cause damage to livestock on communal or privately owned land. The predators concerned could originate on the land or they could have moved from neighbouring land that is either privately owned, communal or state land and which may or may not be declared a protected area.

There is no clear legal framework for the management and control of predators in South Africa. Although there is a plethora of national and provincial legislation and policies, much of this is conflicting and outdated. The provincial nature conservation ordinances that applied in pre-1994 South Africa to the four provinces of the Cape, Orange Free State, Transvaal and Natal still apply in some of the nine new provinces. In addition, some of the nature conservation ordinances of the former homelands continue to apply in some areas. To make matters more confusing, the legislation varies between provinces.

Scientific Assessment link

The single document Livestock Predation and its management in South Africa: A Scientific Assessment, containing detailed and current insights and knowledge into the complex situation of predation management, is available on the PMF website. Click here to view and download the publication.

https://predsa.mandela.ac.za/Scientific-Assessment-Publication"

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMF Newsletter NOVEMBER 2019[1138]:

- **Full of praise for predation specialist**
- The PMSA Secretariat received a letter from Dwaalhoek Agricultural Association in Upington, Kalahari expressing their appreciation towards the NWGA and RPO for providing funds for Niël Viljoen, predation specialist, to present 'vermin' courses countrywide.

[1137] PMF Newsletter OCTOBER 2019; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[1138] PMF Newsletter NOVEMBER 2019; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - DO NOT DELETE - Version 5.0

- Niël presented a two-day course in the hall of the agricultural association where 46 farmers and workers listened attentively to his interesting presentation. It buzzed with tales and Niël could hardly keep up to answer all the questions. Attendees participated enthusiastically in the practical demonstration to set foothold traps and scouting the area for possible signs of jackals and caracal. There was no hurry back home and the farmers wanted to use every minute to gain by Niël's expertise.
- Christa Rupping of Dwaalhoek send a separate e-mail commending the organisations who are supporting and financing the work of Niël and by presenting this type of courses. "*His knowledge is very valuable and the way in which he conveys the knowledge is phenomenal*", she said.

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter NOVEMBER 2019[1139]:

*"**Black-Backed Jackal – preventive management***

The next leaflet in the Predation Management Information Centre's (PMIC's) series covering the black-backed jackal has information relating to preventive or non-lethal predation methods.

Because no two farms are the same, predation management methods that are effective on one farm may be less effective or even ineffective on another farm. To choose a method or combination of methods suited to circumstances on a particular farm, the size of the farm, topography, type of livestock (species and breed), stocking rates, prevailing environmental and market conditions, and the cost of the method(s) to be used have to be considered.

When making use of preventive, or non-lethal predation management methods, it is important that a combination of methods be used. Methods such as deterrents should be used for short periods at a time, and/or alternated with other methods, to ensure that black-backed jackals do not become accustomed to a particular method or set of methods (and therefore lose their fear of these methods).

The leaflet "Managing jackal – preventive methods" contains more information on this topic, and is available on PMIC's website: ufs.ac.za/natagri/departments-and-divisions/animal-wildlife-and-grassland-sciences-home/alpru/products-and-services/predation-management-information-centre-(pmic)/predators-and-predation

Visit the PMIC website ufs.ac.za/pmic or contact them on +27 51 401 2210 or e-mail: PredationMC@ufs.ac.za"

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter NOVEMBER 2019[1140]:

*"**Dissecting the Scientific Assessment***

Over the next few months, the nine chapters of the Scientific Assessment will be addressed and concluding remarks by the lead authors and authors will be highlighted.

CHAPTER 6

Past and current management of predation on livestock

This chapter assesses the various predation management methods used in South Africa and internationally and considers their application in the South African context. The focus is on the effectiveness of each method and characterises the range of predation management techniques into seven groups:

1. Disruptive deterrents (or primary repellents), which disrupt predator behaviour through a number of mechanisms such as neophobia (fear of novel items), irritation, or pain.

2. Animal husbandry practices, which include methods that shelter livestock from predation.

[1139] PMF Newsletter NOVEMBER 2019; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[1140] PMF Newsletter NOVEMBER 2019; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - Hendrik Weal - Version 5.0

3. Aversive deterrents (or secondary repellents), which deliver a (negative) stimulus in synchrony with a target species' particular behaviour with such regularity that the species learns to associate its behaviour with the stimulus.

4. Provisioning (supplementation) which supplies additional food resources to predators in an attempt to deter them from killing livestock.

5. Non-lethal population control, which aims to suppress or decrease predator population growth or numbers, without killing them.

6. Producer management, which aims to compensate a livestock owner who has suffered livestock losses because of predation.

7. Lethal predator management, which aims to eliminate either individual or entire predator populations.

Scientific Assessment link

The single document Livestock Predation and its management in South Africa: A Scientific Assessment, containing detailed and current insights and knowledge into the complex situation of predation management, is available on the PMF website. Click here to view and download the publication.

predsa.mandela.ac.za/Scientific-Assessment-Publication"

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMF Newsletter DECEMBER 2019[1141]:

- **Management program to control black-backed jackals**
- We get several inquiries regarding this topic. Please visit the PMF website pmfsa.co.za – look under "*knowledge library*" to view and consider the predation management manual for best practices and management plans.

Kruger (2019) developed practical methods to manage predation; technology and procedures to collate information for incorporation in a national database, integral to an information management system (MIS). Effective management of black-backed jackals and caracal pose complex, varying challenges for authorities and landowners. The mobile device applications are valuable contributions to the knowledge base and insights for predation management. The abstract[1142] of the thesis is quoted below:

"Predation on livestock and wildlife is the most prominent facet of human-wildlife conflict worldwide. Yet, it is the least understood, in part due to the disparity in methods used to collect data and report results relating to predation and predation management. Predation management is a highly controversial issue and the lack of scientific information is a major concern and impediment for initiatives to devise effective and acceptable management strategies.

The purpose of this study was twofold: (a) to conduct a detailed farm-level investigation into predation vs predation management in areas where high levels of predation had previously been reported, and (b) to develop a tool to provide livestock farmers and wildlife ranchers with a means of reporting predation and practices employed to curb the impact of predation. Building on the groundwork laid by previous studies in South Africa, this study aimed to provide a basis for improving our understanding of the dynamics of human-predator conflict on farm level as well as on a larger scale in an attempt to address some of the current research gaps.

This study explored a succession of methods to collect information on predation and predation management on farm-level and develop a tool to collect such data. Initially, questionnaires were used to collect data, concurrent with the process of developing a digital data collection tool. The data collected by means of the questionnaires were used

[1141] PMF Newsletter DECEMBER 2019; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

[1142] Kruger, Quinette, 2019. Developing a management information system for coordinated predation management in South Africa. Ph.D. (Wildlife) thesis. University of the Free State, Bloemfontein, South Africa. http://hdl.handle.net/11660/10657.

Version 5.0 - H.O. de Waal - Version 5.0

to test this tool (two mobile device applications). The challenges presented during the study and those associated with other methods of data collection played a central role in the data collection methodology developed in the study.

At the onset of the study, questionnaires were used to collect information on predation experienced, predator control methods practised, as well as other factors known to influence predation, such as demographic information, physical and managerial characteristics of a farm, and husbandry practices. Though showing potential to provide invaluable information, the questionnaire methodology used in the early phases of this study highlighted fundamental issues regarding the use of conventional data collection methods and the lack of coordinated predation management systems that thwarted the objectives initially set for this study. Consequently, the focus also shifted toward developing a Management Information System (MIS) through which predation management data may be used to develop sound mitigation strategies and, ultimately, inform Best Management Practices.

This thesis discusses the development and value of digital data collection methods, specifically mobile device applications, for use in predation management. It also highlights the importance of coordinated action and institutional memory to ensure a structured and focused approach to inform improved predation management strategies in South Africa. To achieve this goal, a system of coordinated predation management must have an MIS at its core.

Practical methodologies were developed to manage predation, focusing on more effective technology and procedures to collate relevant information for incorporation into a national database as part of an MIS. Data collected with such methodology presents the opportunity to assist authorities, landowners and other role players with a notable range of coordinated predation management options. The effective and sustainable management of mesopredators poses a range of complicated and varying challenges for responsible authorities and landowners, in South Africa but also worldwide. The development of two mobile device applications are valuable tools to assist role players in livestock predation management.

The outcome of this study is an important and valuable contribution to the knowledge base and insights available to manage damage-causing predators more sustainably. It laid a firm foundation for a comprehensive MIS to inform predation management in South Africa."

2020

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter JANUARY 2020[1143]:

*"**1 Predation training***

Because predation is regarded as a threat to wool sheep farming, the service contract for the National Woolgrowers' Association of SA includes specific target areas for predation management.

The 2018/19 annual report of the NWGA gave a written account on predation training. The target was to train at least 150 farmers and farmer workers annually in the extensive grazing areas: 75 in the summer cropping area and 30 in the winter cropping area. The outcome, however, was beyond expectation. A total of 426 farmers and farm workers were trained in the best practices of predation management, which represents a success rate of 170%."

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter JANUARY 2020[1144]:

*"**2 Dissecting Scientific Assessment***

[1143] PMF Newsletter JANUARY 2020; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[1144] PMF Newsletter JANUARY 2020; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - HD Carnivore - Version 5.0

Over the past few months, six of the nine chapters of the Scientific Assessment have been addressed and concluding remarks by lead authors and authors were highlighted. We will continue with the last three chapters this year, covering the biology and ecology of the black-backed jackal and the caracal, the role of mesopredators in ecosystems, and the biology, ecology and interaction of other predators with livestock.

CHAPTER 7

Biology and ecology of black-backed jackal and caracal

One might expect research pertaining to the biology and ecology of black-backed jackals and caracals to be substantial, since they are livestock predators. However, this is not the case. Throughout this chapter the author highlights several data deficiencies and indicates areas where research is urgently required to address predation on livestock and valued wildlife species. Available research has been biased towards the feeding ecology of the two species, with comparatively little information on social behaviour, activity patterns, reproduction, home range and habitat selection, dispersal, and population densities. Additionally, research is spatially biased, focusing on a subset of biomes. Given the adaptability of these predators, research needs to be replicated across several habitats for accurate predictions on variation in biology and ecology between regions.

Most research on black-backed jackals and caracals has been conducted in nature reserves, with little research done on commercial livestock farms, game farms, and communal areas. The anthropogenic impacts (e.g. prey and predator management) vary tremendously among these land uses, which should translate into variation in the biology and ecology of both black-backed jackals and caracals.

Scientific Assessment link

The single document Livestock Predation and its Management in South Africa: A Scientific Assessment, containing detailed and current insight into and knowledge about the complex situation of predation management is available on the PMF website.

Click here to view and download the publication.

predsa.mandela.ac.za/Scientific-Assessment-Publication"

The following item was reported in the PMF Newsletter JANUARY 2020[1145]:

"3 News from the desk of the Predation Management Centre (PMC)

The Predation Management Centre, operating within the University of the Free State in Bloemfontein, would like to wish every reader a prosperous and peaceful 2020.

Over the past year, the Cape Leopard Trust has made considerable progress regarding evidence-based predation management. Verification officers trained in the identification of leopard predation incidents as well as other types of livestock losses help monitor leopard predation in their communities and assist CapeNature in keeping accurate records of predation incidents. The officers were nominated as part of an informal skills development initiative to help the Cape Leopard Trust evaluate the true extent of leopard predation in the Cederberg. Visit capeleopard.org.za to find out more about the Cape Leopard Trust's efforts at predation management.

The PMC would like to see more evidence-based predation management in 2020.

Please visit their website ufs.ac.za/pmic or contact them on Tel: +27 51 401 2210 or email: PredationMC@ufs.ac.za."

In February 2020 a novel coronavirus emanated from China and struck the globe; it caused a lethal condition Covid-19 in humans with unprecedented global alarm. On 15 March 2020, the South African government declared a National State of Disaster and imposed a total National Lockdown from midnight 26 March 2020. Of special importance was the total clampdown on

[1145] PMF Newsletter JANUARY 2020; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

travelling, except for emergencies and the consequent devastating economic impact on most sectors of economic activity in South Africa.

This Lockdown also affected the livestock farming and wildlife ranching communities. Professional problem animal hunters were also restricted and could not provide the normal routine services. Farmers and ranchers could still implement customary predation control on their farms, but many relied on the services of professional problem animal hunters. Very little information is available, but it is safe to assume that during the Lockdown, the livestock and wildlife losses caused by predators in South Africa would have continued unabated.

The following item was reported in the PMSA[1146] Newsletter FEBRUARY 2020[1147]:

> *"**1 Assessing the jackals among the sheep***
>
> *Reviewer Prof. Brian Reilly speaks positively on the PredSA publication that was released in 2018. He regards it as a high-quality narrative, but its major value lies in the comprehensive literature cited. At the end of each chapter knowledge gaps are identified, and suggestions raised as to where optimal scientific and financial investments in the future should lie.*
>
> *The book will be useful in many areas of research and may also help to change attitudes towards land and wildlife management.*
>
> *Click here to read his review pmfsa.co.za/images/news/PredSA_Review1.pdf."*

The following item was reported in the PMSA Newsletter FEBRUARY 2020[1148]:

> *"**2 Dissecting Scientific Assessment***
>
> *Over the past few months, seven of the nine chapters of the Scientific Assessment have been addressed and concluding remarks by lead authors and authors were highlighted. This month we are focusing on the role of mesopredators in ecosystems, and the last chapter relating to the biology, ecology, and interaction of other predators with livestock will be dealt with next month.*
>
> ***CHAPTER 8***
>
> ***The role of mesopredators in ecosystems: potential effects of managing their populations on ecosystem processes and biodiversity***
>
> *Mesopredators are vital for ecosystem functioning and biodiversity. Most of the research effort and funding in South Africa are directed at charismatic apex predators as much as in the rest of the world.*
>
> *This chapter highlights the multitude of ecological roles that mesopredators play; however, our general understanding of these roles for black-backed jackal and caracal is limited.*
>
> *Much of what we know about the removal of these mesopredators from agri-pastoral landscapes comes from inference rather than rigorous inquiry. However, based on the above discussion, removing black-backed jackals and caracals from simple agri-pastoral environments could result in a greater abundance of small mammals (i.e. rodents) that could limit plant regeneration through seed predation. The loss of black-backed jackal could result in small ungulate numbers increasing with a resulting increase in livestock–wild ungulate competition. However, under this scenario, the remaining black-backed jackals and caracals would have abundant prey, potentially reducing predation on livestock where wild prey is still caught preferentially. The loss of black-backed jackals and caracals may result in an increase in population densities of bat-eared fox, Cape fox, black-footed cat, African wild cat, genet species, and many mongoose species, but may also lead to differences in their relative abundance (and subsequent losses of prey*

[1146] Editor's Note: From February 2020 the PMF Newsletter changed its name to PMSA Newsletter.
[1147] PMSA Newsletter FEBRUARY 2020; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[1148] PMSA Newsletter FEBRUARY 2020; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

species of these specialised predators) in certain habitats. These populations may flourish if rodent numbers are high.

Scientific Assessment link

The single document Livestock Predation and its Management in South Africa: A Scientific Assessment, containing detailed and current insight and knowledge into the complex situation of predation management is available on the PMF website.

Click here to view and download the publication.

predsa.mandela.ac.za/Scientific-Assessment-Publication"

The following item was reported in the PMSA Newsletter FEBRUARY 2020[1149]:

*"**3 News from the desk of the Predation Management Centre (PMC)***

Control of black-backed jackal (lethal management)

Black-backed jackal control can be used to reduce black-backed jackal numbers or to eliminate individuals causing damage in areas experiencing livestock losses due to these predators. Best results are often obtained when control (lethal) methods are used in combination with preventive (non-lethal) methods of predation management. As with preventive methods, the choice of control method depends on, among others, terrain, prevailing environmental conditions, and the cost of the methods.

Our leaflet "Managing jackal – corrective methods" contains more information on the control of black-backed jackal, and is available here:

ufs.ac.za/docs/librariesprovider22/pmic-documents/01_05-managing-jackal---corrective.pdf?sfvrsn=64759a21_2

This leaflet covers only some of the legal methods currently in use. Although other methods of control are also available, little or no scientific information is available for those methods.

The methods described here are restricted methods in terms of the National Environmental Management: Biodiversity Act, 2004 (Act No. 10 of 2004). It is therefore advisable to contact your local conservation authority when considering the use of any of these methods.

For more information on the methods or specialists in the field of predator control, please visit their website ufs.ac.za/pmic or contact them on Tel: +27 51 401 2210 or email: PredationMC@ufs.ac.za"

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMSA Newsletter MARCH 2020[1150]:

- **1 Farmers … conservers and cornerstones of a healthy biodiversity**
- Predation specialist Niël Viljoen entered the 13th year of research and studies on monitor farms. What initially began as experimental farms where predator management and control method were tested, compared and adjusted, the farms eventually proved to be examples of success going far beyond successful predator management.
- He was astonished by the integrity, knowledge and passion of farmers for the continued existence of the industry; the also acknowledge their deep dependence and respect for the piece of land where the eek out an existence. The cooperative agreement and understanding between farmer and Mother Nature is unbelievable.
- Biodiversity and our modern South African farmers
- The most important goal for existence by all life on earth is a probably good and healthy biodiversity. It can be summarised as biological diversity, which also mean variety, and include all forms of life on earth: organisms, plants, animals; the whole spectrum of ecosystems in all conceivable geographical regions of our planet. It is an interwoven, complicated interaction between a variety of species.

[1149] PMSA Newsletter FEBRUARY 2020; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

[1150] PMSA Newsletter MARCH 2020; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

- Biodiversity is Mother Nature's well-oiled machine to protects herself, maintain a healthy balance and to identify any disturbance in any of her ecosystems as soon as possible, analyse it and balance it again. A healthy biodiversity is key to humankind's survival. Our daily life sustaining resources (food, clothing and water) is directly dependant on biodiversity. Thus, it is important that the modern producers (commercial farmers) should not lose sight of biodiversity. Recent studies in South Africa showed that biodiversity in commercial farms is healthier than in some parks. It is a feather in the hat for commercial producers.
- The biggest obstacle for a healthy biodiversity is unfortunately one of the constituting species of the total picture of our plant, namely humankind, you and I.
- About one third of the planet's available land mass is used for commercial agriculture. Almost 80% of the land in South Africa is available for some form of agriculture. Thus, it is clear what huge role agriculturists play in maintaining a good, healthy biodiversity.
- Mother Nature can try her best for biodiversity, but with 80% of it in the hands of agriculturists, it may be a risk, and she needs help. Thanks to people with a passion, well-informed and trained conservers and farmers, Mother Nature gets more than her share of healthy biodiversity from commercial agriculture. What is this aid, the anchor that commercial farmers in South Africa use to bolster biodiversity? The answer is easy, biosecurity.
- What is biosecurity? A set of preventative measures is designed to safeguard biological resources and prevent the spreading of diseases and pests in any form over the agricultural sectors, animals, and humans. In short, it safeguards, protects and ensures your and my living circumstances; it is the protection of the complete health situation.
- What does it mean for the agriculturist and in this case the livestock farmer?
- Absolute risk control and management on your farm and work environment. One of the biggest threats for biosecurity are people, who are in many instances the carrier or spreader of germs, parasites and viruses. For the farmer the culprit may be his veld shoes, vehicles and lorries, the local veterinarian, agricultural advisor, bank manager or visiting neighbour.
- It is noticeable how farmers in recent years became aware of the restrictions and/or avoidance of unknown movement on some parts of the farming.
- Electronic gates do restrict many unwanted trespassing by unauthorised persons.
- At many feedlots, entrance is refused to the pens and at intensive systems such as lamb pens and feedlots, only the workers may enter the premises. Then washing of hands and walking through a footbath is compulsory. The buying of livestock be it from other farms or livestock auctions is a very big risk-area threatening biosecurity. Quarantine camps or pens are common on farms. Not only people or livestock threaten biosecurity. Another worrying factor receive little attention. Wild animals that move over farms may be possible carriers and are risk factors, especially baboons, bush pigs, warthogs and eve predators such as caracal and jackals. Well isolated farm boundaries, be it jackal-proof or electrified fences, is a bonus for biosecurity. The threat for this security measure are the destructive effect of bush pigs and warthog on fences. The natural migration and relocation of game remain a big risk, even with regard to dead animals. Professional predator hunters move between farms with the dead carcasses strung on the vehicles, eventually dumping it at another site.
- Biosecurity is a compulsory contribution of farmers to a healthier biodiversity, but farmers alone are not the only role players in this regard. Biosecurity requires involvement and cooperation by scientists, policymakers and law enforcers.

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMSA Newsletter MARCH 2020[1151]:

- **2 Was it not for Niël Viljoen, I would not have farmed with sheep anymore**
- Kobus, Gerrit and Klein Casper Craffert of Utrecht, KwaZulu-Natal expressed thanks for Niël Viljoen, predation specialist who manages a monitor farm for 11 years with them.

[1151] PMSA Newsletter MARCH 2020; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - HO or Wsal - version 5.0

- They were fortunate to meet Viljoen in 2009 when he started doing research and data collection on behalf of the NWGA to investigate the effect of predators have on sheep farming. According to Kobus, Viljoen transferred with great passion his knowledge about jackals and their behaviour and explained how jackal dens and hunting methods must be observed and managed, but not exterminated.
- Every year when he visited the Crafferts to record jackal numbers, advice was also provided on how to replace their extensive way of farming with more intensive farming. The sheep are now sleeping safely in jackal-proof camps and ewes lamb close to the homestead in enclosed camps.
- There are fewer pleasing sights to observe than when camps are opened in the morning to the calm ewes and beautiful lambs at play. Thank you very much, Niël Viljoen … Karoo farmer and jackals' man.

The following item was reported in the PMSA Newsletter MARCH 2020[1152]:

> ***"3 Draft norms and standards are guidelines rather than legislation***
>
> *The Department of Environment, Forestry and Fisheries (DEFF) has finalised draft norms and standards for the management of damage-causing animals in South Africa (DCA N&S), for implementation. These norms and standards have been developed in terms of the National Environmental Management: Biodiversity Act, 2004 (Act No. 10 of 2004) (NEMBA). The minister responsible for the environment may set indicators to measure compliance with the provisions of any norms and standards developed in terms of NEMBA.*
>
> *However, due to the fact that species such as black-backed jackal and caracal, and methods per se, are not regulated through NEMBA and the Threatened or Protected Species (TOPS) Regulations, it is not possible to implement and enforce the provisions of the DCA N&S in a uniform manner. It is for this reason that it was decided at an inter-provincial meeting that the DCA N&S would be implemented as voluntary guidelines, and not as legislation.*
>
> *The DEFF will convert the draft DCA N&S to guidelines and make it available through the Predation Management South Africa (PMSA) for further distribution to its member organisations and their members."*

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMSA Newsletter APRIL 2020[1153]:

- **1 Professional hunters a benefit for the farmer**
- Daily commercial agriculture face new challenges, which must be addressed to produce successful. Challenges may be human factors, but the most taxing challenges for any farmer are those thrown his way by Mother Nature. No budget or planning can forecast external factors such as droughts. Farming is completely dependent on natural factors and it is important to look after the food producers during these difficult times. Equally unpredictable as Mother Nature, is the impact of predators on the agricultural sector. Again, it is important to cater for the needs of farmers and reduce predation losses to a minimum.
- The PMSA strives to support livestock farmers by establishing a well-trained professional national platform that promote and phase in SAQA accredited problem animal management specialists in a system of professional services. Not only is protection from predators needed, but also from untrained problem animal specialists that may cost the farmer more than the actual problem. It may exacerbate and not solve the problem. Government support to deal with the situation seems unlikely; protecting the livestock herd/flock is primarily the responsibility of the farmer, but with a good professional platform, livestock farmers can handle this problem much more effective.

[1152] PMSA Newsletter MARCH 2020; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[1153] PMSA Newsletter APRIL 2020; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 – Hoofdmaal - Version 5.0

- It is understood that all agriculture value chains will be fully functional from 1 May and in this framework, PMSA is confident that professional problem animal specialists will continue their responsibilities.

The following item was reported in the PMSA Newsletter APRIL 2020[1154]:

2 Monitor farms – a good predation management tool

In his latest report, predation specialist Niel Viljoen uses information from monitor farms to assess predation losses in support of predation management training in South Africa. These figures, dating back to 2008, reveal the position and challenges that livestock farming has been facing over the past 12 years.

The extensive training programme conducted by the NWGA to train livestock producers, farm workers and professional predation management specialists surely had its challenges under extreme drought conditions, with predators continuously changing and adapting their hunting preferences. The monitor farms established by the NWGA had a crucial role to play through constant evaluation of the effectiveness of different management tools. These tools inform farmers through training, to ensure the survival of their livestock and of the farming community as a whole.

A total of 21 monitor farms covering an area of 116 002 hectares have been identified for training, research, and experimenting with different management strategies to identify the best workable solution for this conflict between predators and livestock farmers.

From the experience and valuable information gained on these monitor farms, the following became evident:

1. Training is extremely important to keep farmers well informed in order to be able to adapt to predator behaviour continually, and to implement pre-planned management strategies to reduce livestock losses.

2. As management strategies are tested and evaluated on an annual basis, farmers can look back on achievements and learn by example, thereby prompting correct predation management programmes combined with unique management strategies for specific farms."

The following item was reported in the PMSA Newsletter APRIL 2020[1155]:

"3 Thank you AgriSETA

The impact of predation losses is not only felt in the wool industry, but the livestock and wildlife industries as well. PMSA would like to thank AgriSETA for its support of the extensive predation training programme of the NWGA to train livestock producers, farm workers and professional predation management specialists."

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMSA Newsletter APRIL 2020[1156]:

- **4 Poison a deaf nail for biosecurity**
- In this article, Dr. Gerhard Verdoorn of the Griffon Poison Information Centre refers to articles and cases where crows have been poisoned with pesticide.
- Biosecurity is a strategic and integrated approach that analyse policy and regulatory frameworks (including instruments and activities) and manage risks in the sectors of food safety, animal life and health, plant life and health, as well as associated environmental risks.
- The world is seriously constrained by the current coronavirus pandemic. Apart from the risk for human health and lives, there is also the total collapse of economies across the world. All that remained steady, at least for the near future, is the agricultural sector, simply because humankind must eat. Crop and livestock producers is busy to produce food that must keep the

[1154] PMSA Newsletter APRIL 2020; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[1155] PMSA Newsletter APRIL 2020; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[1156] PMSA Newsletter APRIL 2020; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

world going. In spite of most South African farmers just having escaped from a devastating drought.

The following item was reported in the PMSA Newsletter APRIL 2020[1157]:

> *"**5 Predation Management Centre (PMC)***
>
> *The University of the Free State Predation Management Centre (PMC) is still operating during the national lockdown period, although some activities and meetings with stakeholders have been put on hold. Since we are working from home, we can confidently continue sourcing, processing, and disseminating information about predation management.*
>
> *The PMC has also uploaded links to some instructive videos on predation management-related topics on our website. One of these videos covers the conflict between humans and dingoes in Australia; a conflict not much different from that between humans and black-backed jackals in South Africa. A notable difference, however, is that the dingo is still regarded by some as an introduced species. This explains the differences in predation management strategies implemented in Australia, such as the Dingo Barrier Fence and the use of 1080. Watch the video here: youtube.com/watch?v=KbbtziC2wW4&t=34s"*

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMSA Newsletter MAY 2020[1158]:

- **1 Toolbox must change and adapt to current circumstances**
- Joseph Steyn, a concerned farmer and activist near Prins Albert, share his thoughts about the increasing predation livestock losses in spite of the **toolbox** with control methods.
- "*The continuing drought is described as a lengthy crisis and trauma that does not come to an end, and is more traumatic for the farmer because of the link with the elements of surprise, disappointment, incompetency, anxiety and continuous disillusion about vermin that maul sheep and goats*", said Steyn.
- Changing farm sizes and less labour, as well as farm gate produce prices declining annually up to 3% in real terms, necessitate a more effective and affordable control method.
- No control method is available for predators, which is comparable with the success obtained for internal and external parasites or organisms such as pulpy kidney or blue tongue.
- The Responsible Wool Standards (RWS) provide many directives for best practices to protect the integrity of the product, but provide is no workable method to protect sheep in larger areas against predators.
- Five years ago, a pregnant Dorper ewe was mauled by jackals near Laingsburg/Prins Albert and was big news. This year the number is close to 250 in the same areas. Farmers that use the toolbox with control methods say that they lose from 50% to 100% of their breeding stock because of predation.
- The century old toolbox used to control problem animals needs a total reform, because the farming scene has changed radically.
- The past few decades the world exploded technologically, therefore, research is necessary to develop new methods to control predators and make small livestock farming sustainable again. Steyn said a research action must be launched by the industries.

The following item was reported in the PMSA Newsletter MAY 2020[1159]:

> *"**2 Assessing the jackals among the sheep: a review of PredSA***
>
> *Prof Brian Reilly of the Tshwane University of Technology, Pretoria, has reviewed Livestock predation in South Africa: a scientific assessment and this has been published*

[1157] PMSA Newsletter APRIL 2020; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[1158] PMSA Newsletter MAY 2020; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[1159] PMSA Newsletter MAY 2020; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - Mode Wait - Version 5.0

in the South African Journal of Science (2020, Vol 116, Number 1/2), and may be found at doi.org/10.17159/sajs.2020/7459.

This is the third review, with another two provided by non-South Africans. These reviews are also available on the PredSA ResearchGate site at researchgate.net/project/A-Scientific-Assessment-of-livestock-predation-in-South-Africa."

The following item was reported in the PMSA Newsletter MAY 2020[1160]:

*"**3 Leaflets on predators***

The Predation Management Centre (PMC) has sourced several studies completed over the past ten years on predators and/or predation management. Reviewing each of these documents to update our information leaflets and databases is something that will keep us busy for some time. Stay tuned for updates on these studies.

In the meantime, the first leaflet in our series covering the caracal is available here: ufs.ac.za/docs/librariesprovider22/pmic-documents/02-caracal_general.pdf?sfvrsn=36549521_2.

The caracal is an opportunist, like other predators, but it preys mainly on mammals. It also has definite preferences for certain prey species, including hyrax (dassie), springhare and other rodents that may also cause damage on farms. Dietary studies have shown that caracals play a key role in controlling the numbers of these species.

Studies have shown that caracal on farmland prefer natural prey over livestock. Some caracal may, however, develop a taste for livestock, and may cause extensive damage on livestock farms. Knowing the situation on a particular farm and the interactions among predators on that farm may contribute substantially to effective predation management.

Visit the website ufs.ac.za/pmc for more information, or contact us at PredationMC@ufs.ac.za with any comments, questions or personal accounts of caracal in your area or on your farm."

The following item was reported in the PMSA Newsletter MAY 2020[1161]:

*"**4 Designated website for management of predators***

Predation specialist Niel Viljoen has set up a website to share his knowledge on livestock predation and management. Go to nielviljoen.co.za to access features relating to fence planning and construction, lambing areas, training schedule courses, and much more. Entry to the website will require a registration process and login."

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMSA Newsletter MAY 2020[1162]:

*"**5 List of qualified professional hunters***

In the May newsletter, the importance of demanding services of qualified professional hunters according to the SA Qualification Authority (SAQA) was accentuated. Herewith a list of qualified hunters.

Province	Surname	Name	District	Contact
Western Cape	Pienaar	Schalk	Beaufort West	076 012 8684
Eastern Cape	Jordaan	Willem-Louw	Hofmeyer	083 261 6462
	Mulder	Taffie	Klipplaat	082 295 3136
	Nel	Christo	Uitenhage	073 549 2360
Free State	Pienaar	Arno	Edenburg	078 197 5148
Northern Cape	Janse van Rensburg	SP	Hopetown	082 453 9045
	Badenhorst	Johann	Douglas	072 806 7249"

[1160] PMSA Newsletter MAY 2020; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[1161] PMSA Newsletter MAY 2020; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[1162] PMSA Newsletter MAY 2020; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - HD de Waal - Version 5.0

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMSA Newsletter JUNE 2020[1163]:

- **1 Electrifying fences for meaningful predation management**
- Dr. Koos Louw, a small livestock farmer of Williston holds the view that electrifying fences should be used as cost effective aid in predation management for extensive small livestock farming.
- Predation is a major obstacle for farming successful and sustainable in extensive areas with small livestock. The Williston area that suffered drought the past seven years, predation management is somewhat neglected, because many farmers use smaller lambing camps, lambing pens and/or feedlots for the ewes to lamb.
- Dr. Louw collected information from fellow farmers to do the following 'farmers' sum. He found that farmers lose at least 30%, and probably ever a higher percentage of lambs to predation because boundary fences are not properly maintained.
- Calculations were based on 5 000 ha farm and a farmer with 500 ewes at a possible weaning percentage of 100% (it may even be higher) with an electrified fence, with only a 70% weaning percentage without the electrified fence.
- 100% of 500 ewes = gross income of R500 000/year.
- 70% of 500 ewes = gross income of R350 000/year; thus a loss of R150 000.
- Cost of electrifying will depend on the type of fencing you already have and your final expectation. In Dr. Louw's experience, electrifying the top strand is not good, because caracal jump over, while electrifying only bottom strands are recommended. Ensure that the bottom strands are 100% electrified before is spend on the top strand. The bottom electric strand should be higher than 7 to 10 cm from the ground and the offsets must be firm. Talk to other farmers in the area to limit errors, because it is not necessary to reinvent the wheel.
- To upgrade a 1.1 m fence with six droppers per 20 m and seven steel strands to 1.1 m with 12 droppers per 20 m and 13 steel strands will cost about R9.20/m.
  - To upgrade a jackal-proof fence in relative good condition and electrify a new bottom strand will cost about R5.10/m.
  - A brand new jackal-proof fence, 1.3 m high with 1.2 m mesh wire (with 90 mm openings), and electrified will cost about R22.80/m.
- The cost to fencing a 5 000 ha (5 km x 10 km) farm will be the following:
  - A camp fence of 1.1 m can be upgraded and electrified as described above for about R276 000 (R9.20/m) and repaid within two years.
  - Most farms have jackal-proof fences and to upgrade and electrify it will costs R153 000 (R5.10/m) – a real bargain.
  - A brand new jackal-proof fence will cost about R680 000 (R22.80/m) and can be repaid in five years.
- **Important to know**
- Maintenance of boundary fences are very important, because a fence is as good as its weakest point.
- If practical, ensure there is an inspection road along the electrified fence (remember the eye of the master fattens the goose).
- There are also different scenarios regarding income:
  - Extensive farmers that sell lambs over the scale
  - Extensive farming with an intensive component, e.g. lamb in lamb pens or in a smaller camp near the homestead, with larger camps to put the stronger lambs
  - 100% meat producers
  - Wool/mohair producers
- The calculation of every producer will differ, but electrifying boundary fences are very cost effective and one of the most eco-friendly predation management methods.

[1163] PMSA Newsletter JUNE 2020; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

- "*My father always joked that if you want to buy land in the Karoo, you must do your calculations at candle light, because the sums tally better*", said Dr. Louw, but the calculation for electrification can be done in bright sunlight – it tallies!
- Dr. Louw thanked Mr. Frans van Niekerk of the farm Bleskrans for his thorough research regarding the cost of electrifying fences.

The following item was reported in the PMSA Newsletter JUNE 2020[1164]:

*"**2 Stray dogs***

In the next two months, we will be looking at the nationwide problem of stray dogs and the illegal hunting of wildlife with dogs, shared by David Wardle, small stock farmer in the Cathcart district of the Eastern Cape.

In his capacity as small stock farmer and previous chairperson of the Thomas River Conservancy, Wardle has been dealing with the problem of stray dogs and illegal dog hunting for several years. He is confident that he represents the views and knowledge of most game and small stock farmers throughout the country.

Most people involved in greyhound breeding as well as law enforcement officers are aware of the problem of stray dogs and the sport of dog hunting. In many cases, they are involved and endorse the actions of the communities and the clients of greyhound breeders (dog buyers).

The following categories are deemed problematic and cause devastation to small stock and game farmers across the country:

1. *Stock theft, coupled with the use of damage-causing dogs*
2. *Unattended stray dogs*
3. *Small-scale hunting for the pot*
4. *Illegal large-scale dog hunting and betting ("taxi hunting")*

INTENTIONAL STOCK THEFT COUPLED WITH DAMAGE-CAUSING DOGS

Stock theft, a common practice, is associated with stealing sheep, goats, or other small stock, with dogs assisting in the process. Often these dogs are used to scare the sheep to the edges of the camps where they can be caught and tied. Sometimes the dogs are used to catch and drag down the sheep to capture and tie them up for transport. Usually, large syndicates or gangs are involved in the theft and business is done with the spoils. In the Cathcart region especially, theft is executed on a grand scale and up to 50 small stock are stolen at a time and then loaded and sold elsewhere, or slaughtered locally.

UNATTENDED STRAY DOGS

In towns and townships across the country there are many dogs that are homeless and totally neglected by their owners. These dogs roam the streets and suburbs trying to survive on whatever they can scrounge from bins, gutters, and dumps. Then they begin to form relationships and a pecking order and eventually hunting packs develop, and they learn to survive like wild dogs.

This is when they are most destructive. These dogs wander out into the farmlands and wreak havoc on game and small-stock farms. Scores of sheep, goats, and wildlife are often mauled, mangled, or killed during these raids by wild domestic dogs.

Often the dogs that were previously used in stock theft become part of these packs. They sometimes remember where they were used for stock theft, and head out to the same regions and begin to tackle and maul small stock. These raids into the farms often result in scores or even hundreds of sheep being killed or mauled."

The following item was reported in the PMSA Newsletter JUNE 2020[1165]:

[1164] PMSA Newsletter JUNE 2020; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[1165] PMSA Newsletter JUNE 2020; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

*"**3 Leaflets on predators***

The Predation Management Centre (PMC) has sourced several studies on predators and/or predation management. They are currently reviewing each of these documents to update their information leaflets.

Feeding behaviour of the caracal

The next leaflet in their caracal series summarises some of the research focusing on the diet and feeding ecology of the caracal in South Africa. The leaflet is available here: ufs.ac.za/docs/librariesprovider22/pmic-documents/02_03_1-caracal-feeding-behaviour.pdf?sfvrsn=40b29421_4

Like the black-backed jackal, the caracal is a generalist and opportunistic predator. This means that caracals tend to prey on the most abundant prey available at any particular time. Even though plant material and insects form a large proportion of the black-backed jackal's diet, caracals mainly eat mammals.

Sheep and goats often are the most abundant prey on small livestock farms. Still, several studies have found that caracals on farmland prefer natural prey over domestic livestock. Some studies report that there are individual caracals on some farms that feed exclusively on natural prey. They do not kill any livestock. With other caracals, livestock comprises a small proportion of the diet.

Caracals kill large numbers of natural prey (including other damage-causing animals such as rodents, dassies, and smaller predators) each year. Territorial caracals will also prevent potential damage-causing caracals (such as young caracals that leave the mother's territory in search of their own) from settling in the area. However, when a particular caracal does develop a taste for livestock, it can cause extensive damage on livestock farms. Scientists have therefore recommended that territorial caracals, which are known not to kill livestock, should not be killed. Determining whether the caracals in an area kill livestock or not, may contribute substantially to effective predation management of a farm.

Links to some of these studies and other recent predator–predator and human–predator conflict-related research conducted in South Africa are available here:

ufs.ac.za/natagri/departments-and-divisions/animal-wildlife-and-grassland-sciences-home/alpru/products-and-services/predation-management-information-centre-(pmic)/new-research

Visit their website: ufs.ac.za/pmc for more information, or contact us via e-mail: PredationMC@ufs.ac.za with any comments, questions or personal accounts of caracal in your area or on your farm."

The following item was reported in the PMSA Newsletter JULY 2020[1166]:

*"**1 Illegal hunting with dogs***

In June, the nationwide problem of stray dogs was shared by David Wardle, small stock farmer in the Cathcart district of the Eastern Cape. This month he investigates the practice of taxi hunting or what is commonly known as "illegal large-scale hunting with dogs". He describes it as an extremely damaging, intimidating, dangerous, and underrated form of abuse of farmers and their livelihoods.

In his capacity as small stock farmer and previous chairman of the Thomas River Conservancy, Wardle has been dealing with the problem of stray dogs and illegal dog hunting for several years. He is confident that he represents the views and knowledge of most game and small stock farmers throughout the country.

According to Wardle, this pastime is well known in all farming communities and especially on farms where farmers are conservation-conscious. Unfortunately, the game farms where conservancies are active become targets for this weekend sport.

[1166] PMSA Newsletter JULY 2020; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 – Final Draft Version 5.0

Ever since the banning of dog racing, the taxi hunts have increased and flourished into huge weekend sports worth several hundred thousand rand on any given day. Betting on dogs in dog racing has been replaced by betting on dogs that hunt game on private land. It involves judges, bookies, huntsmen, and large sums of money. Even bearers are paid to gut and carry the animals that are killed during these outings. Dogs are rated and bets are placed before the outing. Judges decide which dogs have killed or performed best and the pay-outs are done by the bookies.

Dog hunting on the increase

Taxi hunting is prevalent in KwaZulu-Natal (KZN) and has recently spread throughout South Africa, especially in the Eastern Cape (EC). Wardle is concerned that the growth in the EC will reach the same levels as KZN. Often, in small town districts, fleets of taxis loaded with men and towing trailers loaded with dogs, are observed arriving in town. The hunts are well-orchestrated and are preceded and concluded with social events. In some cases, they involve up to 30 men with more than 100 dogs, which creates a dangerous situation. In some areas it has become so bad that farmers are told when hunting is to take place and threatened not to intervene as they could be killed.

Often the hunt for game goes wrong and the dogs end up mauling sheep. Sometimes when the dogs are bored from no exercise, they escape from their homes and owners, form packs and go out alone to cause much damage on small game and livestock.

Wardle recalled the time when he, at great risk to himself and his family, arrested seven poachers who were conducting a hunt on his property with 17 greyhounds and .308 and .22 rifles. Their two vehicles were loaded with dead springbuck. The men were arrested and after 14 months of court hearings, were found guilty and fined R2 200. The SPCA had to foot the bill for keeping the dogs for such a long period of time and further incurred costs of R38 000, which was never recovered. What is most disturbing is that the seven poachers were not poor people hunting for the pot, but a maths school teacher from a local high school, a Correctional Services officer, a businessman from Mdantsane, a South African army officer, a farm worker and one unemployed young man.

Farmers feel unprotected

Unfortunately, authorities do not seem to take illegal dog hunting as a serious crime because reaction time is slow and mistakes in investigations make it difficult to prosecute. Often the culprits are wealthy individuals who hire lawyers to fight cases.

Farmers are increasingly growing tired of these illegal activities. They feel unprotected and are treated as criminals when all they want to do is protect their properties. They seek proper and decisive action from the police and conservation authorities. Municipalities should enforce the necessary laws and by-laws regarding dog ownership and the stray dog problem should be tackled head-on.

Organised agriculture trying to assist

As the issue of illegal hunting with dogs resides with the Safety Committee of Agri SA and the TLU, the comments from Mr Willie Clack provide a legislative overview.

Illegal hunting with dogs is nothing new in the rural areas of South Africa and can be traced back to around 1891 when a restriction was placed on traditional hunting. Ever since the problems arose, farmers and nature conservationists have been exasperated by the problem. The first reaction was the criminalisation of illegal hunting in a variety of legislation in South Africa, of which the most important are:

- *The Stock Theft Act, 1959 (Act No. 57 of 1959)*
- *The Game Theft Act, 1991 (Act No. 105 of 1991)*
- *The Trespass Act, 1959 (Act No. 6 of 1959)*
- *Common Law*
- *Provincial Nature Conservation Ordinances and Acts*
- *The Animal Protection Act, 1962 (Act No. 71 of 1962)*

Version 5.0 - HQ de Waal - Version 5.0

• The National Environmental Management: Biodiversity Act, 2004 (Act No. 10 of 2004)

• The Criminal Procedure Act, 1977 (Act No 51 of 1977)

All the above legislation prescribes procedure and punishment when found guilty of illegal hunting, but it has become obvious that the legislation is not regarded a serious matter for government and especially the criminal justice system. Notwithstanding the seriousness of the crime, the activity has a long cultural history, coupled with tradition and subsistence. The result is that many law enforcement officials in the rural areas do not make any attempts to make arrests and/or prosecute perpetrators.

Not incorporated in crime statistics

The prominence the crime deserves is lessened because it does not receive much media attention and when it does, it is reported haphazardly. The crime is also forgotten as it is not incorporated into any crime statistics and no-one knows what the extent and economic effect is on the agricultural economy.

No research of any kind is being done and it is imperative that illegal hunting becomes a more prominent crime receiving the attention of the academic fraternities. Until concrete facts regarding the extent of the crime are made public and brought to the attention of the government, farmers and conservationists will continue to be frustrated."

The following item was reported in the PMSA Newsletter JULY 2020[1167]:

"2 Monitor farms a source of good advice on predation management

The extensive training programme conducted by predation specialist Niel Viljoen through Predation Management SA (PMSA) has been a challenge under extreme drought conditions, with predators continuously changing and adapting their hunting preferences and causing harm to livestock. Viljoen trains livestock producers, farm workers and professional predation management specialists in predation management. The monitor farms established by the NWGA have a crucial role to play. By constantly evaluating the effectiveness of different management tools, farmers are informed and trained to ensure the survival of their livestock and the farming community as a whole.

Through experience and valuable lessons learnt on these monitor farms over the past 12 years it is clear that training is extremely important. It empowers farmers to not only adapt to predator behaviour but to also implement pre-planned management strategies to reduce livestock losses.

Because of this initiative of the PMSA, farmers can now look back on the achievements on monitor farms and learn by example, as management strategies are tested and evaluated on an annual basis. The information obtained on these monitor farms helps livestock producers to decide on the correct predation management programme and combine it with different management strategies for that specific farm.

It is important to take into consideration the harsh conditions experienced in livestock farming over the past four to five years, given the extreme weather conditions and drought in some parts of our country. Monitor farms have been the leading examples of adapting to not only livestock and predator management strategies, but also the new challenges arising from outside the boundaries of the farm. The objective is to try and keep a stable predation management plan in place in spite of the impact of the drought. Stability through these extreme conditions is the key to profitable enterprise. Losses other than predation, especially from the drought, have escalated to levels far higher than expected. This had a ripple effect on some predators like the black-backed jackal, which is a scavenger by nature. The smell of dead animals in the air every night seems to have triggered abnormal hunting behaviour, leading to more casualties among livestock.

[1167] PMSA Newsletter JULY 2020; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - Model Wait Version 1.0

The drought has had a striking effect on other animals not normally classified as predators causing damage to livestock. Forced by nature and the scarcity of their natural food sources, these animals turn to a much easier prey: livestock. Examples are animals like the baboon, seagull, bush pig, Cape fox, African wildcat, black eagle, Marchelle eagle, and the biggest culprit of them all, the honey badger. With all these new culprits threatening the livestock industry there is an even greater need for further improvement in training and management strategies.

The NWGA monitor farms remain strategically important to keep updating the content of the training programme to facilitate predation management that protects, secures and invests in good and healthy biodiversity.

The financial support from AgriSETA and the wool and red meat industry is herewith acknowledged with appreciation."

The following item was reported in the PMSA Newsletter JULY 2020[1168]:

*"**3 History of predation***

The latest version of "Predation management in South Africa – historical milestones" is available on the Predation Management Centre (PMC) website. The document details the course of predation management in South Africa since the 1950s, compiled from information contained in official reports, letters, minutes and publications. Recreating institutional memory about the way predation management has been conducted in South Africa to date may provide the foundation on which to build future efforts at coordinated predation management. Read the document here:

ufs.ac.za/docs/librariesprovider22/pmic-documents/predation-management-in-south-africa---historical-milestones-jul-2020_ver-4.1.pdf?sfvrsn=88159221_4.

In a new segment on the PMC website, we will be presenting summaries of some of the research conducted over the past decade. These summaries, written by the authors themselves, serve to inform the general public about their research on predators, predation management, and other human–predator conflict-related topics.

Each summary will describe why and how the research was conducted and will provide a brief outline of the findings of the research and recommendations for future predation management efforts to mitigate human–predator conflict.

The first summary available on this page covers research completed in 2019 by Dr Renelle Terblanche from Stellenbosch University on the conflict between black-backed jackals and farmers around the Square Kilometre Array (SKA) in the Karoo. The title of the project is: "Ongediertes: A critical qualitative study of farmer–black-backed jackal conflict and its management around the Square Kilometre Array core site in the Northern Cape, South Africa".

To read the summary, follow the link: ufs.ac.za/natagri/departments-and-divisions/animal-wildlife-and-grassland-sciences-home/alpru/products-and-services/predation-management-information-centre-(pmic)/new-research.

Visit their website: ufs.ac.za/pmc for more information, or contact via e-mail: PredationMC@ufs.ac.za with any comments, questions or personal accounts of caracal in your area or on your farm."

The following item was reported in the PMSA Newsletter AUGUST 2020[1169]:

"1 Who is PMSA?

Predation Management South Africa (PMSA) is a national entity representing the National Woolgrowers' Association of South Africa (NWGA), the South African Mohair Growers' Association (SAMGA), Red Meat Producers' Organisation (RPO) and Wildlife

[1168] PMSA Newsletter JULY 2020; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[1169] PMSA Newsletter AUGUST 2020; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

Ranching SA (WRSA). The organisation strives to coordinate efforts to address the problem of predation on livestock and wildlife, which is currently the priority threat to these industries. The Department of Environment, Forestry and Fisheries (DEFF) and the Department of Agriculture, Land Reform and Rural Development are also represented on PMSA."

The following item was reported in the PMSA Newsletter AUGUST 2020[1170]:

*"**2 SANParks an important representative on forum***

SANParks has officially been invited to form part of the PMSA to participate in its efforts to address predation challenges, since predators that impact on livestock and wildlife, in many cases, originate from national parks. Chief executive officer Mr Fundisile Mketeni has yet to reply."

The following item was reported in the PMSA Newsletter AUGUST 2020[1171]:

*"**3 This website will help manage predation***

Predation expert Niel Viljoen is using his own website to help farmers manage predation effectively. By comparing track and bite marks on the website and completing a short questionnaire, farmers can identify predators immediately. They can also upload, post and share photos on the site, thereby assessing what is happening in a specific district. The website gives comprehensive guidelines to help farmers with the choice of lambing areas, lambing times as well as management strategies and erecting fences. Predation management courses can also be booked through the website.

Visit nielviljoen.co.za"

The following item was reported in the PMSA Newsletter AUGUST 2020[1172]:

*"**4 New research – incorporation of research findings into a management information system***

At the end of 2019, Dr Quinette Kruger from the University of the Free State completed a research project entitled Developing a management information system for coordinated predation management in South Africa.

At first, the project was aimed at taking an in-depth look at predation on farm level in areas where high levels of predation had previously been reported. Part of the project focused on developing a tool for reporting predation and predator control. Collecting long-term data with conventional data-collection methods is challenging, and there is no framework for human–predator conflict research. Therefore, the focus shifted more towards developing methods for future research efforts to incorporate research findings into a management information system.

To read the summary, follow the link: ufs.ac.za/natagri/departments-and-divisions/animal-wildlife-and-grassland-sciences-home/alpru/products-and-services/predation-management-information-centre-(pmic)/new-research.

This page has summaries of some of the research conducted over the past ten years. The summaries, written by the authors themselves, serve to inform the public about their research on predators, predation management, and human–predator conflict-related topics. Each summary describes why and how the research was conducted and gives a brief outline of the findings of the research and recommendations for future efforts to mitigate human–predator conflict.

Visit their website: ufs.ac.za/pmc for more information, or contact via e-mail: PredationMC@ufs.ac.za"

[1170] PMSA Newsletter AUGUST 2020; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[1171] PMSA Newsletter AUGUST 2020; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[1172] PMSA Newsletter AUGUST 2020; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - Hans de Waal - Version 5.0

Pursuant to internal reviewing, the Secretariat: Predation Management South Africa (PMSA) communicated on 14 October 2020 regarding '*Research- & tertiary institutions as well as research structures within agricultural commodities are requested to consider, pursue and or fund research projects and programs in support of priorities*':

'CWSA Research Committee, RMRD SA, Mohair SA Research Committee, ARC, Agri SA – Jolanda Andrag, as well as Tertiary Institutions: Nelson Mandela University – Graham Kerley, University of Free State – Frikkie Neser, UNISA – Haemish Melville, University of Cape Town – Justin O'Riain, University of Mpumalanga – Liaan Minnie, and University of Fort Hare – Craig Tambling.

RESEARCH PRIORITIES: PREDATION MANAGEMENT

Predation Management South Africa (PMSA) is a national entity representative of the National Woolgrowers' Association of SA (NWGA), South African Mohair Growers' Association (SAMGA), Red Meat Producers' Organisation (RPO) and Wildlife Ranching SA (WRSA). PMSA is registered as a Non-Profit Company (NPC) with the following objectives regarding predation management:

1. To participate in the relevant law-making processes that affect the livestock farming and wildlife ranching sectors.

2. To raise funds by entrance fees and / or special subscriptions and by donations, grants or any form of voluntary contributions to secure the objectives of the Forum, which shall include the right to recover monies due to the Forum.

3. To foster and promote liaison between the role-players in the livestock and wildlife ranching industries as well as consumers, members of affiliated members of the Forum as well as between regulatory members.

During the last meeting of the PMSA Executive committee on 26 August 2020, the following priorities for predation management research were identified:

1. Impact and management of Stray dogs on livestock and wildlife;

2. Impact and management of Baboons on livestock, wildlife, and agricultural production (i.e. crops, forestry).

3. Impact and management of Bushpigs on agricultural production (i.e. crops, pastures).

The above priorities are in support of the overall research priority objective of Socio-economic impacts of livestock predation and its prevention in SA, as identified in the Scientific Assessment for Livestock Predation and its management in SA (PredSA), conducted by the Centre for African Conservation Ecology, Nelson Mandela University.

Research- & tertiary institutions as well as research structures within Agricultural commodities are herewith requested to consider, pursue and / or fund research projects and programs in support of these three priorities as far as possible.

Your consideration will be highly appreciated.

Yours cordially,'

On Tuesday 29 September 2020, Netwerk24 published an article by Jackie Kruger online:

- **Pride of lions killed in Karoo National Park**
- After seven lions of the Karoo National Park near Beaufort West have escaped twice in 24 h, they were killed on 29 September 2020.
- In response to an inquiry by Netwerk24, SANParks said in a statement that in the first incidence on Monday (28 September 2020), the pride of lions escaped onto private land at the northern border of the Park along the Nuweveld mountain range.
- The lions killed 10 sheep on the neighbouring farm. Wardens were immediately dispatched to chase the lions back into the Park. The wardens slept in the mountain, in case the lions returned to the carcasses, which they did during the night.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

- According to the statement, the SANParks policy on the management of predators provided for the control of animals that cause damage. It was decided to act immediately to prevent human-wildlife conflict, as well as conservation, and killed the whole pride.
- According to the farmer, Eddie Steenkamp, the lions mauled pregnant ewes, as well as ewes, which have already lambed (photograph).
- SANParks said the mountainous terrain prevented the wardens to get close to the lions (two adult lionesses, three younger lionesses and two male lions). A helicopter was called to assist in killing the lions.
- According to SANParks the pride of lions were regarded as a group of animals causing losses in the high mountainous area along the northern border of the Park and thus posed a serious risk to human lives and livestock.
- SANParks said the park management were continuously in contact with the landowner.
- Eddie Steenkamp of the farm Doornboomsfontein was travelling near Touwsrivier when Netwerk24 phoned him on Tuesday.
- He said, "*I am on my way to the farm to determine the damage*."
- According to Steenkamp, the area is experiencing the most severe drought in years and pregnant ewes were killed.
  - The lion Mufasa was born in the Par and on 15 February 2019, he crept under the fence and was roaming free for 27 days. He was later relocated to another facility; because of security considerations, SANParks would not disclose the site.
  - A photograph of the lion Sylvester, previously in the Karoo National Park.
  - Sylvester, Mufasa's predecessor, evaded a search team for 24 days in 2015. After his second escape in 2016, he was relocated to Kuzuko in die Addo Elephant National Park.

On 3 October 2020, Maroelamedia (https://maroelamedia.co.za/author/christelcornelissen/) published an article by Christel Cornelissen online:

- **SANParks justified its decision to kill seven lions**
- SANParks justifed its decision to kill seven lions of the Karoo National Park and said it was not taken lightly or in haste.
- After escaping recently twice from the Park, the lions were killed. It evoked anger among a number of people.
- SANParks regarded the lions as "*damage causing animals*". Lions that threaten the lives of people and livestock was regarded as an urgent issue. However, decisions are only taken after thorough consideration of the circumstances.
- SANParks said the pride of lions escaped from the Park, killed a number of sheep and posed a threat to people. The pride was accustomed to the area which they occupied and developed the habit to burrow holes under the fences.
- "*The situation was exacerbated by the mountainous terrain and several streams and gullies (dongas) in the Karoo National Park. When a fence crosses a stream or donga, it creates the possibility to offer an escape route, regardless of the fence being well maintained. Rain showers may cause small, localised floods that is sufficiently strong to create a hole in the fence for lions.*"
- SANParks said the risk of the lions escaping again was considerable and it had to act responsibly. The challenge of managing lions and considering how to balance the threats and advantages is a continuous process.
- SANParks said lions are generally opportunistic animals and prefer easy prey. They adapt quickly and when circumstances allow it, easily become habitual livestock depredators.
- "*In most cases when lions start killing livestock, they also lose their fear for humans and these lions are a great threat for people*."
- According to SANParks the option to relocate the pride to another Park or private reserve, was because of limited space – as well as the pride's history of killing livestock – an

Version 5.0 – HO de Waal – Version 5.0

also not viable. As part of SANParks lion management programme, it annually offers to donate lions to South African reserves. Recently there was a marked decline in the number of reserves that could easily accommodate large numbers of lions. The past year no reserve took up this offer of SANParks.

- According to ecologists at SANParks, several factors contribute to the behaviour of lions that cause damage or being regarded as damage-causing animals. It included that male lions mostly disperse when reaching puberty, when the pride moves on and separate when competing with other animals for food, or to mate. When there are no fences and the land between reserves are not used, the threat to people in the area is less.
- In the case of smaller reserves – such as the Karoo National Park, which is surrounded by communities – the challenges are greater.
- SANParks said it is more difficult to manage lions in smaller parks, because they breed more rapidly in the absence of threats for survival. In such a reserve, a lion population can increase annually with 22% if not managed. If the available prey were limited, the lions would start looking for opportunities to escape.
- SANParks said South Africa is one of the top five countries where lions are conserved and that the small reserves play an important role in this regard.
- The Karoo National Park has 14 lions, comprising three or four groups. Two of those groups have collars to monitor the movement of the animals.
- Part of SA news (https://maroelamedia.co.za/kategorie/nuus/sa-nuus/)

On 16 October 2020, the PMC based at the UFS responded in an e-mail to the Secretariat: PMSA:

> *'Hallo dear Bonita*
> *We acknowledge receipt of your e-mail dated 14 October 2020 and the attached letter.*
> *A colleague kindly forwarded the correspondence.*
> *You will recall that the Free State team, comprising colleagues from the National Museum, Bloemfontein, the Glen Agricultural Institute, Free State Department of Agriculture and the University of the Free State, attended the Predation Workshop: Training and Research on 21 February 2019 at the Nelson Mandela University, Port Elizabeth.*
> *Thank you for sharing important information with us.*
> *As requested, we will consider the Research Priorities: Predation Management, which were proposed by the PMSA and set out in your attached letter.*
> *In addition, we will continue our programme to investigate a range of critical research topics, relevant to closing existing and important information gaps in predation management.*
> *We will keep in touch. Regards'*

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMSA Newsletter OCTOBER 2020[1173]:

- **1 Reactive predator control versus predation management – which are you?**

Reactive action (temporary relief) You still farm with yesterday's plan on today's program		**Predation management (permanent sustainable solution)** Prevent losses and provide financial advantages	
Lack of knowledge about predators.	You rely on the number of jackals and caracals that are removed.	Intimate knowledge of the biodiversity of your farm.	You rely on the number of lambs saved before it becomes necessary to eliminate jackals and caracals.
** Low weaning percentage	You know the effectiveness of your	*** Integrated management plan, which	You know and understand the biology and behaviour patterns

[1173] PMSA Newsletter OCTOBER 2020; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

	rifle at 100 m, 200 m and 300 m.	continuously evaluate and adjust the grazing system, flock and predator management plan.	of the different predators.
	You are ready to act after the first lamb was caught.	Critical to apply time and attention equally over the whole spectrum of management.	You are ready to apply resolute seasonal management practices, which include predators.
	A predator caused every loss.	Losses are investigated and causes confirmed.	You strive to learn and adjust.
	Continuous livestock losses.		Financial advantages.
	You think you understand.		You understand.

- **The best weaning percentages are directly linked to the farmer's ability to identify well in advance the most unpredictable and variable element in the management plan – the behaviour of black-backed jackals.
- ***Integrated management plan:

1. Predator management programme: start at the beginning, namely the core areas of predators.
   - When the preferred habitats of predators have been identified, several control measures can be applied.
   - In the case of black-backed jackal, always handle the core areas as if the animals are present (although the breeding pair may have been removed, some new occupants may very well surprise you).
   - Plan livestock and grazing management accordingly.
   - Human made structures such as jackal-proof and electrified fences are without doubt interferences in the daily movement routes of these animals. Protect your livestock flocks, enclose the lambing area, and exclude jackals or fence in the core areas of jackals in your annual planning of the livestock management programme.
   - Use continuous, but alternatingly, the total predator management toolbox at your disposal.
2. Flock management programme: choose lambing seasons carefully and consider the variables in food requirements of predators.
3. Grazing systems: avoid core areas during lambing seasons.

Niël's best advice:

1. Keep predation management with the top management of your business.
2. If you delegate, it will be handled at a second rate.
3. Knowledge is power, but remember the black-backed jackal has the skills. The one that adapts quickest will have the most power.

The following item was reported in the PMSA Newsletter OCTOBER 2020[1174]:

"2 PMSA intervenes to solve issue of damage caused by bush pigs in the Southern Cape area

Predation Management SA (PMSA) met with representatives from SANParks, farmers, Cape Nature, and the Houndsmen Federation to discuss the extensive damage caused by bush pigs on farms in the bigger Knysna area.

Farmers indicated that they have already tried and tested various non-lethal methods to manage, limit, or prevent damage to their crops by bush pigs, which included, but was not limited to fencing, barriers (including stacking of tyres), lights, and noise.

[1174] PMSA Newsletter OCTOBER 2020; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

Rotational crop production, which is based on sound scientific and sustainable production principles and practices, is required to prevent disease build-up in the soil. Therefore, farmers occasionally cultivate land that is in proximity of or borders SANParks property, where the threat of bush pig damage to their crops is much higher.

The use of hounds to pursue and manage damage-causing bush pigs is done in a very responsible way by professional, qualified, and experienced houndsmen with trained dogs to prevent or limit the damage to crops. This method is required where other available methods are shown to be ineffective and is definitely far from commercial hunting. It manages damage-causing animals similar to what is described and allowed under the regulations for threatened or protected species (TOPS) (Regulation 14(4)(c).

Authorisation will be required from SANParks for farms adjacent to their properties, where and when this method of management is planned, before a permit is issued by Cape Nature.

PMSA requested SANParks to consider the authorisation of hunting, based on regulations within the National Environmental Management Protected Areas Act, 2003 (Act 57 of 2003) (NEMPAA).

SANParks is currently awaiting feedback from its legal department regarding legislation and their position on the issue."

The following item was reported in the PMSA Newsletter OCTOBER 2020[1175]:

3 Research outcome – predation on wildlife ranches

The Predation Management Centre (PMC) compiled a summary of the study completed in 2016 on the economic impact of predation in the wildlife ranching industry. The study covered the wildlife industry across South Africa, providing summaries for the economic implications of predation in each of the nine provinces. The following summary provides a broad overview of the study:

SUMMARY OF SCHEPERS, A (2016): THE ECONOMIC IMPACT OF PREDATION IN THE WILDLIFE RANCHING INDUSTRY IN LIMPOPO, SOUTH AFRICA

As compiled by Q Kruger

This study surveyed a random sample of wildlife ranchers who are members of Wildlife Ranching South Africa (WRSA), which comprises about 20% of privately owned wildlife properties in South Africa. The study covered all the provinces of South Africa, but focussed on the economic impact of predation on marketable wildlife in the Limpopo province because it comprises the largest body of WRSA members and is home to a wide range of wildlife.

Because point-of-sale values did not exist for the wildlife industry due to varying prices in the different wildlife sectors (e.g. prices of breeding animals are higher than for animals intended for biltong hunting), calculating the direct cost of predation may lead to over- or underestimation. Therefore, the direct cost of predation was calculated per hectare.

The study provides baseline information that can be used by wildlife ranchers to calculate the total cost due to predation on their properties, using the following equation:

Total cost = (size of the ranch [ha] x wildlife losses x the average price of the animals) + (indirect cost per ha x size of the ranch [ha])

For example: a wildlife rancher who keeps nyalas on 5 000 ha can calculate his/her estimated total cost to be ZAR593 765 per year. A wildlife rancher who keeps blesbok on 12 000 ha can incur a total cost of ZAR668 103 per year and a wildlife rancher who keeps black impala and Livingston eland on 6 000 ha can calculate his/her total cost to be ZAR11 957 637 per year.

[1175] PMSA Newsletter OCTOBER 2020; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - M de Waal - Version 5.0

The table below has been compiled from data contained in the thesis for each of the provinces in South Africa. Gauteng is not listed in the table because the ranches of the wildlife ranchers from Gauteng were in Limpopo.

Table 1: Summary of the wildlife losses reported in each of the provinces.

Province	Ranchers surveyed	Hectares covered	Total predation losses	Total losses per rancher	Total losses per hectare
Limpopo	201	432 647	13 127	147	0.072
North West	61	140 922	2 398	123	0.052
Free State	64	109 345	2 599	174	0.076
Eastern Cape	11	38 350	1 097	109	0.072
KwaZulu-Natal	3	3 691	564	292	0.054
Mpumalanga	4	4 700	292	173	0.165
Northern Cape	8	112 600	791	163	0.013
Western Cape	2	3 856	20	20	0.007

Factors affecting the level of predation differed among the three wildlife groups (large, small, and scarce species or colour variants) in Limpopo. For instance, the level of predation on small antelope species was lower when non-lethal control such as cameras, lights and/or radios were used. In the large antelope group, predation was higher when black-backed jackals were hunted by specialist hunters. In the scarce species/colour variant antelope group, predation was higher when game ranch owners hunted caracals, but lower when owners managed predation (for example, by lights/radios and cameras) Wildlife ranchers in Limpopo reported that wildlife losses were caused mostly by leopard, with caracal second. Black-backed jackal (killing mainly large and small antelope species) and cheetah (killing mainly scarce species/colour variant wildlife species) were third.

The study found that game ranchers who physically counted the antelope on their ranches reported higher predation than those who estimated losses. It is also suggested that physical counting places stress on the animals, which may make them more susceptible to predation.

The study concluded that predation losses will always occur on game ranches, but can be reduced using preferably non-lethal methods, but also with judicious use of lethal control. The specific species on the wildlife ranch will determine which management and control methods to use. Predation on wildlife ranches can be reduced when wildlife ranchers manage it themselves and work together with livestock producer organisations and organised agriculture.

The full text copy of this thesis can be viewed here:

scholar.ufs.ac.za:8080/xmlui/bitstream/handle/11660/4048/ScheepersA.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

Visit the PMC website ufs.ac.za/pmc or contact via e-mail: PredationMC@ufs.ac.za.

On 20 November 2020, Mr. Louis Wessels, Manager: Legal Services and Administration, Agri Western Cape invited Prof. HO de Waal to attend (on behalf of ALPRU) a stakeholders meeting in Beaufort West:

"Dear Madam/Sir

Agri Western Cape (AWC) received a request from producers adjacent to the Karoo National Park to facilitate an urgent meeting with all relevant role players. The request is was initiated due to challenges agricultural producers adjacent to the Karoo National Park faces with problem animals on their property. AWC and producers believe that the majority of challenges can be solved with communication and cooperation between parties.

We therefor kindly request that you attend the following meeting, of which the Agenda is attached hereto for ease of reference:

Date/Time/Venue: 24 November 2020, 12:00 – 14:00, Beaufort West, ASK Office, BKB Building (First floor), 150 Donkun Street 150."

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

On 23 November 2020, the following updated agenda was received by e-mail:

*"**AGENDA KAROO NASIONALE PARK / KAROO NATIONAL PARK***
24 NOVEMBER 2020 (12:00 – 14:00)
Beaufort-Wes Rolbalklub: Alportstraat / Beaufort-West Bowling Club: Alport Street
1. Opening en verwelkoming / Opening and welcoming
2. Verskonings / Apologies
3. Mosies / Motions
4. Voltooiing van die sakelys / Finalisation of agenda
5. Bestuur van Probleemdiere in Karoo Nasionale Park / Management of Problem Animals in the Karoo National Park
6. Standaard van park heinings / Standard of park fences
7. Onderhoud aan heinings \ Maintenance of park fences
8. Ontsnapping van Probleemdiere uit Karoo Nasionale Park / Escaping of Problem Animals from the Karoo National Park
9. Verdere sake vir bespreking / Further matters for discussion:
9.1 …….
9.2 …….
9.3 …….
9.4 …….
10. Afsluiting / Conclusion"

The meeting on 24 November 2020 at the Beaufort-West Bowling Club was attended by 24 persons (attendance register), representing (number of persons in brackets) Agri Western Cape (3), SANParks (5), CapeNature (2), Agri Fraserburg/PMSA (1), PMSA[1176] (1), PMF (1), Agri Central Karoo (1), UFS/ALPRU (1) and farmers (9).

On Friday 27 November 2020, Mr. Daniël Minnaar send the following e-mail on behalf of Mr. Jannie Strydom, Chief Executive Officer, Agri Western Cape:

*"**SANPARKS/Agri Western Cape (farmers) meeting - priority items***
Good day
I would like to thank everybody for attending the meeting and the constructive contributions in solving the issues at hand. Herewith a summary of the priority actions to be taken and associated timelines:
1. Cape Nature to inspect the fences and report on their findings – before 18 December 2020.
2. Emergency response and swift communication with adjacent farmers. As soon as SANPARKS becomes aware of situation wrt lions "escaping", they will immediately inform Mr. Dean Gouws who will inform all relevant famers via whatsapp groups – continuously.
3. SANPARKS will with immediate effect address the number of lions in the Park. The proposed number is 6 lions (5 with collars) – as soon as possible.
4. SANPARKS will continue with their own inspection of the fences as well as maintenance – continuously.
5. SANPARKS will conduct a study determining the "identification" of the Park's brown hyenas. This will enable the Park to reimburse farmers when their livestock is killed by the Park's brown hyenas – first quarter of 2021.
6. SANPARKS to be allowed to have access to the fence via farms. Prior arrangements will be made to access the fence via farms as there is an official "Farm access protocol" included in the National Rural Safety Strategy – continuously.
Please feel free to add any comments to the above priorities. Kind regards,"

[1176] Editor's Note: Mr. Niël Viljoen (PMSA) was present, but apparently failed to sign the attendance register.

Version 5.0 - HOLD Wend - Version 5.0

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMSA Newsletter NOVEMBER 2020[1177]:

- **1 WRSA new kid on the block at PMSA**
- Predation Management South Africa (PMSA) welcomed Richard York, newly appointed CEO of Wildlife Ranching SA, on the executive committee and predation forum. He took over from Adri Kitshoff Botha, who represented since 2016 the interest of the wildlife ranching industry on the PMSA.

The following item was reported in the PMSA Newsletter NOVEMBER 2020[1178]:

*"**2 Stray dogs, baboons and bushpigs have become research priorities***

During the last meeting of the PMSA executive committee, the following priorities for predation management research were identified regarding the management and impact of:

- *stray dogs on livestock and wildlife;*
- *baboons on livestock, wildlife, and agricultural production (crops or forestry); and*
- *bushpigs on agricultural production (crops or pastures).*

Research and tertiary institutions as well as research structures within agricultural commodities were requested to consider, pursue and/or fund research projects and programmes in support of the three priorities. These priorities support the research objectives of the Scientific Assessment for Livestock Predation and its management in SA."

The following item was reported in the PMSA Newsletter NOVEMBER 2020[1179]:

*"**3 Take predation survey and stand a chance to win a safari for two***

All livestock farmers are invited to take part in a predation opinion and management survey. This would assist a student doing his master's in conservation science to establish the different predator control methods that farmers are using, particularly the use of livestock guardian dogs.

The survey is voluntary and anonymous, and all the research findings will be available to interested persons. It will take about 35 minutes to complete.

For those who complete the survey there is a chance to win an amazing prize – a safari for two to Botswana, worth $5 878 (roughly R95 000).

CLICK HERE to start the Predator Opinion & Management Survey.

survey.alchemer.com/s3/5991383/Predator-Opinion-Management-Survey"

The following item was reported in the PMSA Newsletter NOVEMBER 2020[1180]:

*"**4 Leaflets on predators – caracal***

The Predation Management Centre (PMC) has sourced several studies on predators and/or predation management. In this edition, they cover the reproduction cycle of the caracal.

Caracals breed once a year. Although they can breed any time during the year, most litters are born during summer. After a pregnancy of 70 to 80 days, females give birth to one to four young in old aardvark holes or other types of cavities. On average, only two kittens survive to adulthood. Most predation on livestock and antelope species occurs during the time of year when females get pregnant and must care for their young. The young are weaned at four to six months of age but may stay with the female until they are 12 months old. They usually leave the female's home range during autumn, when rodent density in the veld are at its lowest. For more information, read the leaflet here:

[1177] PMSA Newsletter NOVEMBER 2020; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[1178] PMSA Newsletter NOVEMBER 2020; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[1179] PMSA Newsletter NOVEMBER 2020; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[1180] PMSA Newsletter NOVEMBER 2020; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - HQ de Waal - Version 5.0

ufs.ac.za/docs/librariesprovider22/pmic-documents/02_02_1-reproduction-of-caracal.pdf?sfvrsn=3cde6b20_2

For a bibliography consulted to compile the caracal information leaflets, follow this link: www.ufs.ac.za/docs/librariesprovider22/pmic-documents/bibliography_caracal-leaflets.pdf?sfvrsn=15de6b20_2

Visit their website ufs.ac.za/pmc for more information, or contact them at PredationMC@ufs.ac.za with any comments, questions or personal accounts of caracal in your area or on your farm."

The following item was reported in the PMSA Newsletter NOVEMBER 2020[1181]:

*"**5 Advice on how to deal with illegal hunting with dogs***

A useful article on illegal hunting with dogs was published in agriOrbit on 19 October 2020. In this article, a legal expert provides tips and advice on some of the legal aspects of illegal hunting for farmers who experience this problem. Read the full article here: agriorbit.com/illegal-hunting-with-dogs-what-farmers-can-do/"

The following item was reported in the PMSA Newsletter DECEMBER 2020[1182]:

*"**1 Karoo National Park***

Niel Viljoen represented Predation Management South Africa (PMSA) during the second week of December to inspect the fencing around the Karoo National Park with SANParks and Cape Nature. This follows complaints of damage-causing animals (DCAs), including lions, escaping from the park."

The following item was reported in the PMSA Newsletter DECEMBER 2020[1183]:

*"**2 From the desk of the Predation Management Centre (PMC)***

The PMC wishes every reader a safe and peaceful festive season. For those who will be travelling, may you return home safely and well rested.

The PMC has sourced several studies on predators and/or predation management. In this edition they cover the hunting techniques of caracal.

Caracals also have characteristic feeding patterns. This information leaflet details some of the feeding signs on the carcass of a large prey item such as a sheep, goat or antelope. Such information is useful to confirm whether a caracal was responsible for killing the animal. Read the leaflet here:

ufs.ac.za/docs/librariesprovider22/pmic-documents/02_08_1-predation-by-caracal.pdf?sfvrsn=1ebf6a20_2

For a list of literature consulted to compile our series of caracal leaflets, see:

ufs.ac.za/docs/librariesprovider22/pmic-documents/bibliography_caracal-leafletsd3ab05e75b146fc79f4fff0600aa9400.pdf?sfvrsn=77bf6a20_2

Predation management in South Africa – historical milestones details the course of predation management in South Africa since the 1950s, to recreate institutional memory about the way predation management has been conducted to date. The latest version (November 2020) of the document is available on the PMC website. Read the document here: ufs.ac.za/docs/librariesprovider22/pmic-documents/predation-management-in-south-africa---historical-milestones-jul-2020_ver-4.1.pdf?sfvrsn=88159221_4"

2021

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMSA Newsletter JANUARY 2021[1184]:

- **1 Locating jackals with drones**

[1181] PMSA Newsletter NOVEMBER 2020; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[1182] PMSA Newsletter DECEMBER 2020; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[1183] PMSA Newsletter DECEMBER 2020; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[1184] PMSA Newsletter JANUARY 2021; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 – HO de Waal

- Joseph Steyn, sheep farmer in the Prins Albert district, shares his experience with in locating jackals with 'n drone. His conclusions and resulting need for another control method to reduce predation losses in the changing circumstances are welcomed.
- It is a common feature of all predator control methods that predators are not easily fooled. Only a well-placed foothold trap by a competent hunter leaves jackals without an option. According to Meyburgh Theron, a seasoned helicopter pilot who hunts jackals and game, jackals are invisible because they do not want to get up or hide somewhere.
- Therefore, the Western Cape Department of Agriculture became involved and offered to locate jackals with a Mavic 2 Enterprise Dual drone with a thermal sensor. Except when they hide in holes, jackals may be located under bushes or trees, with temperature differences discernible in colour on a screen.
- Steyn confirmed that a Mavic Pro drone (without thermal capacity) have been used previously to locate black-backed jackals late in the afternoon. Unlike kudu and bat-eared foxes that usually run as if their lives depend on it, one of the jackals stood still and looked around, with the drone above it. In this would be the general behaviour of jackals towards drones, it could become a handy method to locate or control predators.
- During a weekend, a drone flew from six launching stations at different times varying from before sunrise until several hours after sunset. Sheep were first observed at sunrise. It was interesting to note the sheep four-month wool. With an ambient temperature of 15 degrees, the temperature of the wool was 16 degrees as indicated by colour differences on the screen. Several steenbok were detected at night, but no jackals were located.
- **Conclusions:**
  1. Considering the drone had to return to its launching station, the areas it could cover with limited flying time, was too small. Disadvantages of a short flight time are:
  a) Images of animals differed little from the environment, making it difficult to detect them.
  b) Too short battery life (about 25 minutes). By keeping more charged batteries at hand for the drone, this problem could be addressed.
  2. It is necessary to identify fleeing animals quickly, but unfortunately, the resolution of the camera was too poor to do this effectively.
- In a changing farming environment of increasing farm sizes, less labour and higher operating costs, farmers are looking for a method to trump the clever qualities of jackals. The ideal would be a cheaper, but highly effective piece of equipment to thoroughly scan larger areas and reduce the predator population.
- Steyn was full of praise for the enthusiam and empathy of the Western Cape Department of Agriculture with the project.

The following item was reported in the PMSA Newsletter JANUARY 2021[1185]:

> ***"2 Leaflets on predators – caracal management***
>
> *PMC has sourced several studies on predators and predation management. In this edition, they describe some of the most common lethal and non-lethal methods to reduce predation on livestock by caracals.*
>
> *As discussed in their series on the black-backed jackal, a combination of methods, or different combinations during different times of the year, often yield the best results. The choice of methods will depend on the terrain, prevailing environmental conditions, and the cost of the methods, among others. With a proper knowledge of the physical and managerial characteristics of a farm, environmental conditions, and the predator species causing damage on a farm, the farmer or farm manager will be able to choose the method(s) best suited for the farm.*
>
> *Because the caracal's diet consists mainly of other species that can also cause damage on farms (rodents and other carnivores), scientists and predation management*

[1185] PMSA Newsletter JANUARY 2021; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - Not the final version 5.0

specialists have stressed the importance of focusing caracal control efforts on identifying and removing (where practical) only individuals that cause damage. Territorial caracals also ensure that non-territorials, which are more likely to cause damage, do not stay in a particular area for long. The leaflet, "Caracal Management", is available here: ufs.ac.za/docs/librariesprovider22/pmic-documents/02_04_1-caracal-management.pdf?sfvrsn=1d216920_2

For a list of literature consulted for compiling our series of caracal leaflets, see: ufs.ac.za/docs/librariesprovider22/pmic-documents/bibliography_caracal-leafletsd23506e75b146fc79f4fff0600aa9400.pdf?sfvrsn=76216920_2

In addition to our information leaflets covering the most common damage-causing animals, our web page on predators and predation (ufs.ac.za/natagri/departments-and-divisions/animal-wildlife-and-grassland-sciences-home/alpru/products-and-services/predation-management-information-centre-(pmic)/predators-and-predation) contains a list of links to predation management guides and manuals with useful practical advice on managing damage-causing animals.

Visit the Predation Management Centre website ufs.ac.za/pmic or contact them on email: PredationMC@ufs.ac.za for more information on the methods described here or for specialists in the field of predator control."

In a PMSA WhatsApp message dated 4 February 2021, Bonita Francis of the Predation Management SA (PMSA) Secretariat, wrote (translation):

"Good morning members of the Predation Management Forum,

Please bring this to the attention of your members and ask farmers that if they observe such jackals, to take photographs and send it to Dr. Verdoorn at 082-446-8946 via WhatsApp with the farm name and district where it was found.

About five years ago livestock farmers and wildlife ranchers from several areas in the country contacted the Predation Management Forum and inquired about the 'strange' black-backed jackals that some or all their hair. Further investigation and discussions with several well known veterinarians indicated it was mange mites that caused the adverse condition among jackals.

Reports from the Eastern Cape and Northern Cape from Beaufort West through Koffiefontein to close in the Kalahari showed black-backed jackals have been severely affected by mange. In some districts, the black-backed jackals were almost completely decimated by the severe incidence of mange. On wildlife ranches near Phalaborwa in Limpopo, jackals were very scarce after mange decimated many.

Discussions with veterinarians and ecologists hypothesised that the exceptionally large jackal population caused stress in the population and under such conditions, a species is more susceptible for parasites and diseases. It was however puzzling why the mites could spread so quickly and wide among the black-backed jackal population. It was confirmed by Prof. Graham Kerley of the Nelson Mandela University and his research team that black-backed jackals moved over very long distances for example from the Addo Elephant National Park to the Karoo National Park, which is a few hundred kilometre apart. With such a wide dispersion, it is logical to accept that the mites may transfer between jackals.

Dr. Gerhard Verdoorn of the Griffon Poison Information Centre and predation specialist received many inquiries from farmers during January about jackals with mange. Among other from JJ van der Walt near Middelburg in Mpumalanga who shot four jackals in poor condition and the hair almost completely absent. Mange mites are very irritating and cause severe hair loss and because of the constant irritation, the jackals lose condition, emaciate and eventually die. Farmers are very concerned that the mites may be transferred to their livestock, antelope and even dogs. However, veterinarians agree it will not happen because the mites are species specific. Secondly,

Version 5.0 - NO Cover Wrap - Version 5.0

no cases have been noted where small and large livestock or antelop have been affected by mange mites, even in areas with high incidences of mange among jackals.

He requested farmers to observe bat-eared foxes and Cape foxes and note if they are also contaminated with mites; thus far, no such reports have been received regarding these two fox species. All indications are that the mange mite plague is restricted to only black-backed jackals.

Three years ago, during his annual hunting on the reserve Breslau near Pontdrift, he specifically looked at the jackals, but only a few had mange with no such indications among the antelope."

The following item was reported in the PMSA Newsletter FEBRUARY 2021[1186]:

1 Proposed research on bush pig in protected area buffer zones on the Garden Route

by Lizette Moolman, Megan Taplin and Stefanie Freitag, SANParks

Across the African continent, farmers see bush pigs as a nuisance due to their persistent and often devastating crop raiding. Of the species known to damage crops, which include elephant (Loxodonta africana), hippopotamus (Hippopotamus amphibius), buffalo (Syncerus caffer), vervet monkey (Cercopithecus aethiops arenarius), porcupine (Hystrix africaeaustralis) and warthog (Phacochoerus africanus), bush pig is in the top three species causing the most crop damage or the most raiding incidents.

Bush pigs are found widely in the southern Cape forests, including those managed by South African National Parks (SANParks). The Garden Route National Park (GRNP), proclaimed in 2009, is surrounded by many smallholdings and farmland, several of which border indigenous Afrotemperate forest – ideal bush pig habitat. Extensive scientific literature exists on the human wildlife interface (HWI) on agricultural land neighbouring protected areas in the rest of Africa and on damage-causing animals (DCAs) such as bush pigs. However, the literature is scant on areas surrounding the southern Cape forests. In the 1990s Dr Armin Seydack conducted the most comprehensive research on bush pig in the Cape. His research focused on ecological aspects of the species, but with a minor focus on bush pig as a DCA on farmlands. Information about conservation challenges related to bush pig damage is vague and relies mostly on hearsay and infrequent incident reports.

In 2020, the Predation Management South Africa (PMSA) alerted SANParks about bush pigs damaging neighbouring private landowners' maize crops in the Knysna area. PMSA, SANParks, and affected farm managers discussed the matter in late 2020. The farmers were open to further investigation and research on the issue, to be driven by SANParks. SANParks approached collaborating researchers with experience in the field of human and wildlife conflict at Nelson Mandela University (NMU, George Campus), to set up a joint research project. NMU and SANParks researchers and managers visited one of the farms most affected by bush pig damage. The farmer pledged his support for research on bush pig behaviour and potential solutions to reduce damage. This is a major step to better understand the drivers of bush pig landscape use and behaviour, which will be important for trying alternative approaches to reduce their impact.

The field visit helped researchers gain context-specific insights to formulate a plan of action (POA) for the research. The POA is currently being fine-tuned. In the meantime, SANParks and NMU are expanding camera trapping efforts to collect crucial baseline data on bush pig behaviour on the farm mentioned. This will be expanded to other areas in future. A better understanding of local bush pig behaviour will help to evaluate different damage mitigation methods. The aim is to reduce damage to crops and livelihoods by making suitable trade-offs between biodiversity conservation and agricultural production.

[1186] PMSA Newsletter FEBRUARY 2021; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 – HOLD Final Version 5.0

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMSA Newsletter FEBRUARY 2021[1187]:

- **Mange rampant again among black-backed jackals**
- About five years ago, livestock farmers and wildlife ranchers in various parts of the country contacted the predation management forum enquiring about "strange" black-backed jackals that lost hair partly or completely. At closer investigation and discussions with well-known veterinarians, the conditions appeared to be caused by mange mites.
- Reports of black-backed jackals being severely affected by mange were received from the Eastern Cape, Northern Cape from Beaufort West, to Koffiefontein and close to the Kalahari. In some districts, black-backed jackals have died off almost completely, partly because of the severe mange contamination. After being severely affected by mange, jackals were very scarce on wildlife ranches near Phalaborwa in Limpopo.
- Discussions with veterinarians and ecologists gave rise to the hypothesis that the exceptionally large jackal population created stress in the population. When a species is stressed, it is more susceptible to parasites and diseases. It was inquired how mites could spread so rapidly and widely among the black-backed jackal population. Prof. Graham Kerley of the Nelson Mandela University and his research team confirmed that black-backed jackal moved over long distances, for example from the Addo Elephant National Park to the Karoo National Park, which is a few hundred kilometres. With such a wide dispersion, it was logical to accept the jackals contaminated each other with the parasite.
- During January, Dr. Gerhard Verdoorn, predation specialist of the Griffon Poison Information Centre, received many inquiries from farmers about mange among jackals. JJ van der Walt of Middelburg, Mpumalanga shot four such jackals were in a very poor condition – the hair were almost completely absent. Mange mites are very irritating and cause hair to fall out. The continuous irritation cause the animals to lose conditions and emaciate until they die. Farmers are concerned that mites can be transferred to livestock, game and even their dogs. According to veterinarians it seldom occurs, because the mites are species specific. Secondly, no cases were reported where small livestock, large livestock or game had been affected by mange mites, not even in areas with a high incidence of mange among jackals.
- Farmers were requested to note whether the mites also affected bat-eared foxes and Cape foxes. To date nobody reported such occurrences on these foxes. Indications are that the mite plague is restricted only to black-backed jackals. Three years ago, Dr. Verdoorn hunted in his annual excursion at the Breslau reserve near Pontdrift and specifically looked at the jackals. Only some showed signs of mange and no game showed any signs.
- If farmers observe such jackals, they should take photographs and send it to Dr. Verdoorn via WhatsApp (082 446 8946), stating the name of the farm and the district.

The following item was reported in the PMSA Newsletter FEBRUARY 2021[1188]:

> ***"3 Leaflets on predators: damage-causing stray dogs***
>
> *Vagrant or stray domestic dogs can cause substantial damage on livestock farms, especially farms close to residential areas.*
>
> ***Series: 3-001/1*** *Vagrant (stray or feral) Dog Scientific name: Canis familiaris*
>
> ***Description:***
>
> *Domestic dogs come in many different shapes, sizes and temperaments.*
>
> *Sometimes dogs attack livestock because of their inherent predatory instincts. Dogs may range in size from 30 cm to over 75 cm at the shoulder, or from 5 kg to 70 kg.*
>
> *It is not always feral dogs that attack livestock. Sometimes well-fed family pets may also stray onto livestock camps and cause damage.*

[1187] PMSA Newsletter FEBRUARY 2021; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[1188] PMSA Newsletter FEBRUARY 2021; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

When they operate in packs, dogs can cause substantial damage on livestock and/or poultry farms. Predation by dogs is particularly common on farms close to cities, towns and other human-dominated land-uses.

Small dogs that are unable to kill livestock, sometimes just wound them.

Track/spoor

Dog tracks can be confused with those of cheetah. But dog tracks do not have the W-shaped grooves at the rear part of the footpad and are not as wide as tracks of cat species.

Some dog breeds (for example, Jack Russel) leave a trotting trail that appears diagonal to the direction in which it is travelling, because the animal's body is positioned at an angle when trotting.

Spoor can be between 4.5 and 8.5 cm long, depending on the breed.

Predation impact

Besides the damage caused to livestock and poultry, vagrant dogs also kill small game and ground-nesting birds on farms.

Vagrant dogs were reported to have caused 19-42 livestock losses per year on one Free State farm. A series of studies investigated the economic impact of predation in South Africa. These studies found that in some provinces, domestic dogs were responsible for:

- *up to 2% of all livestock losses (including theft, disease and natural causes) on small livestock farms, and*
- *up to 4% of predation losses (caused by predators only) on large livestock farms.*

Feeding behaviour

Dogs are omnivorous, which means they will eat whatever is available at the time.

Hunting technique/feeding pattern

Dogs do not have a fixed attack pattern. They like to chase prey, biting and tearing randomly at the animal while running alongside it. Therefore, the scene is usually littered with dog spoor/tracks.

Dogs often kill or injure several animals during one attack. Bites may be seen anywhere on the body.

The Predation Management Centre (PMC) has sourced several studies on predators and/or predation management. The attached leaflet on damage-causing predators describes the signs to help identify an attack on livestock by domestic dogs. The leaflet will be available on the PMC website soon.

In situations where a variety of predators may already have eaten from the carcass when discovered, skinning the carcass is useful for identifying the predator species responsible. When the carcass is skinned from the back of the neck, the placement of the puncture marks made by the canines (e.g. on the back of the neck or on the throat) and the distance between the puncture marks should be examined. Where disputes arise over the involvement of a specific dog(s) in livestock killing, measuring the distance between puncture marks can rule out or confirm the animal that caused the damage.

Not much information is available in scientific literature about the damage caused by stray dogs on livestock farms. Most of the information in this leaflet comes from available predation management guides and manuals. A special thank you to Mr Andries Strauss from the Glen Agricultural Institution for supplying more information and images.

Visit the PMC website at ufs.ac.za/pmic or contact them at PredationMC@ufs.ac.za for more information on the methods described here or for specialists in the field of predator control."

The following item was reported in the PMSA Newsletter MARCH 2021[1189]:

[1189] PMSA Newsletter MARCH 2021; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

There is a lion on my stoep

An interesting read from the pen of Dr Sam Ferreira, large mammal ecologist for SANParks, on the impact that lions may have on the livelihoods of people that live next to reserves and national parks. His perspective is that the behaviour and dynamics of lions must be understood, which can play a key role in informing managers to mitigate proactively. In this way, all South Africans can benefit from the value of lions, while minimising the damage they can cause.

South Africa is home to a sizable chunk of Africa's lions – it is among the top African countries with large lion populations like Tanzania and Botswana. In southern Africa lion populations are stable or increasing; elsewhere, lions have a hard time surviving and numbers are dwindling.

Of course, a stock farmer would be happy if lions were to disappear. A game guide somewhere in the Sabi Sand Game Reserve, however, would be unhappy if it were to happen. Lions are of different value to different people. Famous parks like the Kruger National Park will not be worth a visit if there were no more lions.

So why are South Africa's lions doing so well? One reason is that South Africa has two large national parks where lions can exist naturally. Lions in the Kruger National Park or the Kgalagadi live happy lives, at least as much as a lion's life can be happy when it is competing for food. In the Kgalagadi, lions have a royal time catching gemsbok living in the dunes. They have been enjoying the luxury (made a bit easier with boreholes to supply water) for a long time. Such water allows other prey like wildebeest to use the Auob and Nossob rivers year in and year out. This is a great alternative for food when gemsbok is a bit scarcer in a dry season, and also gives some diversity in their cuisine!

In the Kruger, some lions prefer prey like buffalo whereas others prefer smaller prey like zebra and wildebeest. Under certain environmental conditions, their preferred food can change. When changing their diet, lions have some risks because the prey they eat can have bovine tuberculosis with a higher incidence than other prey species. Although 40% of lions end up having the disease, it does not affect the population because lions only die from complications after breeding.

Lions find their prey across large areas that they frequent regularly. These home ranges can be from as small as 20 km^2 to as large as 400 km^2. Because lions live in groups, they can afford to live across relatively large home ranges – this helps to better patrol the area and search for prey than if they were alone. Prides normally make up from two to nine lionesses and their cubs. Adult male lions form coalitions of usually two to four, and they would oversee a pride and mate with the females for about two to four years. The lionesses will have their babies about three months after mating and the youngsters will suckle until about six to seven months old. The young lions have a good time until they are about two-and-a-half years old. Then the big lion chiefs of the pride start expelling young males from the pride. These young males roam around (often many of them die of starvation), until they are strong enough to meet up with one or two others and form a coalition that can oust some of the older chiefs. Lion society is a rough place where there is no mercy!

Even so, when left to do their lion thing, populations respond depending on what the prey is doing. In the Kruger, lion populations have increased because in the past 20 to 30 years, the total biomass of prey available to lions has increased. By 2015, there were 600 lionesses and 1 800 lions in the Kruger National Park. About 450 lions live in private reserves without fences separating them from the Kruger. Because of prey being available in the Kgalagadi in the dry rivers with their boreholes, around 250 lions live there using the South African part of the Transfrontier Park.

The 2 500 or so lions living in these large open spaces, together with certain positive trends in the populations, paint a rosy picture for the conservation-minded South African. Recent drought conditions in the Kruger, however, made it easier for young males to get

Version 5.0 – HO de Waal, Version 5.0

food. Compared to other times, many more young males survived and three to four years later, the incidence of these males leaving the Park has increased. The chiefs of the prides are expelling these males. They are now roaming places until they are big enough to sort out the old chiefs with the help of one or two friends that they teamed up with. The candy store for lion food in the Kgalagadi likely provides enough food for the young males to make it from their bachelor roaming days through to being chiefs of prides.

As a result, young male lions very often go for walkabouts in the Kruger and Kgalagadi. It is hard to have a fence running for thousands of kilometres, whether in the Kruger or the Kgalagadi, that can stop a young male trying to escape the ongoing lion bar fight. In fact, success with conservation creates problems with neighbours. In large landscapes like the Kruger and Kgalagadi, proactively maintaining relationships with neighbours is a key requirement.

It is of great concern when animal rights groups and stakeholders (sitting far from any lion that may end up on their stoep) cause media uproar through comments and lobbying, when authorities kill lions that are causing damage or other problems. It is simple: a human life is immeasurably more valuable than that of a lion. Authorities respect this principle and value basic human rights embedded in international values and, more importantly, South Africa's constitution.

At least 770 more wild lions live in South Africa in 59 small reserves. Each reserve has enough space for only a few prides. Although the lions find their own food and choose their mates, they live in places that have fences. Moving is not easy, especially for young males expelled from prides by the big coalition males. The lions in these 59 places, however, have a different lifestyle than the 8 000 or so lions living in captivity where caretakers feed them daily.

Small, fenced reserves often introduce lions either from the Kgalagadi or from the Kruger National Park stock, primarily because visiting tourists like to see the Big Five – lion, leopard, buffalo, elephant, and rhino. New owners think that the more lions there are the better for tourists, but problems soon arise. The lions increase at over 20% a year and quickly start making big dents in the prey populations. Unchecked lion populations in small reserves will consume all the prey.

So why then would lions eat up everything in small, fenced reserves, but not in the Kruger or the Kgalagadi? It is all about why lions live in prides. Lionesses defend their cubs against alien, roaming males – small reserves have no alien, roaming males. Lionesses also defend their territories against other prides – small reserves have few other prides. Lionesses therefore spend more time on their own catching their own prey, and they catch more prey than when in a pride.

A second problem is because a lioness works hard to get prey on her own, once she has food she will only share the feast with her cubs. Cub survival is therefore much higher in these small reserves. This also helps young males to survive better. The managers of these small reserves now have the same problem that the managers of the Kgalagadi and the Kruger have at times – there are many more young males that the big coalition males need to expel from prides. These young males have a slightly tougher time than those ones in the Kruger or the Kgalagadi. They cannot move away from prides as easily, as small reserves have electric fences that are more efficient than the hundreds of kilometres of fences surrounding big, protected areas. This makes escaping the bar fight in small reserves more difficult but they eventually escape if it drags on.

Managers of these small reserves have come together and set up the Lion Management Forum (LiMF) to learn from one another. A key insight was that managers should think about how to restore the population processes associated with the reasons for lions living in groups. It is nearly impossible to restore these processes in most small reserves. The best practice is then to mimic these processes.

Version 5.0 – PO de Waal – Version 5.0

New alien males cannot turn up because of fences and other places with lions being far away. Therefore, managers introduce new males, mimicking an alien, roaming male, or the take-over of a pride. Natural male take-overs often go with the new males causing reduced survival of the cubs, a natural process. The LiMF managers allow males to have pride control for three to four years before making switches, much like the control male lions have over a pride in large parks.

Young males move away from the pride they were born to because the coalition males expel them. The removal of young males is an important management intervention, as this mimics the dispersal process of young males. It is also an important activity as it reduces the chances of young males escaping from a small reserve and causing problems with livestock on farms next to these reserves.

In large systems, lionesses also occasionally leave prides and join with others. The LiMF managers then also remove lionesses and release them in another small reserve. From 2010 to 2019, 301 males and 193 females were translocated between reserves in South Africa.

Managers also put females on contraception. The aim is to reduce the number of cubs when females and cubs compete for food when they live in groups. Contraception, however, carries risks for lionesses and it is better to put a lioness on the pill only once. This is useful as LiMF best practice suggests allowing lionesses to breed once with a coalition of males to allow evolutionary selection processes to unfold.

What do all these lions in small reserves mean for the conservation-minded South African? Genetically speaking, twenty-five years of lion introductions resulted in the 59 reserves having an overall genetic diversity the same as a large national park. The mixing of genetic stock from different locations is, however, not ideal in the long term. The LiMF best practice advocates applying meta-population management to help deal with this problem.

What is a meta-population? Habitats for any species are seldom good everywhere. Across South Africa, there are many places with suitable habitat for lions, but unsuitable habitat surrounds these good places. A species can persist if individuals can move between these good habitats. The combination of all these good places creates a meta-population. A local population of lions in a small reserve, for instance, is a sub-population of individuals inhabiting it and interacting with sub-populations in other reserves.

In an ideal world lions in these small reserves should follow the critical features of a meta-population. A meta-population of lions would then live across South Africa in different reserves with suitable habitats supporting breeding populations. Secondly, reserves suitable for lions may not have any lions present at times. The quality of lion habitat varies resulting in different birth and death rates among reserves. Thirdly, there should be movement between these reserves with lion populations.

Amazingly, 98% of small reserves where lions live follow at least three of the four criteria for a meta-population. They do so, however, because of management seeking to mimic lion population processes, resulting in only about 4,5% annual growth of lions, rather than 22%. Not everything is perfect, though, as the genetic structures are mixes from sources all over South Africa.

South Africa has nearly 3 300 wild lions, partly because in large parks managers leave lions to play out their natural roles, whereas in small parks managers manage the constraints experienced by lion populations. This gradient of approaches creates a significant contribution to global lion conservation.

The following item was reported in the PMSA Newsletter MARCH 2021[1190]:

"1 Leaflets on predators – Leopards

[1190] PMSA Newsletter MARCH 2021; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 – Made Wild – Version 5.0

The leopard is the widest-ranging large carnivore in South Africa and can be found in most habitat types, from forests to semi-desert areas.

PMC has sourced many studies on predators and/or predation management. The first leaflet on leopards provides a general description of the predator, its diet, and behaviour. It also lists the signs of leopard predation and some of the methods used to manage livestock predation by this species (ufs.ac.za/docs/librariesprovider22/pmic-documents/04-leopard.pdf?sfvrsn=e5276520_2).

Its adaptation to rugged terrain and secretive and silent behaviour allows it to survive outside protected areas and in the vicinity of suburban areas.

Leopards may develop a taste for livestock and may cause extensive damage on livestock farms. Understanding this predator, its interactions with other predators, and general management practices on a particular farm or larger area can help develop effective predation management practices on that farm or area.

More information on the most common damage-causing predators can be viewed here: ufs.ac.za/natagri/departments-and-divisions/animal-wildlife-and-grassland-sciences-home/alpru/products-and-services/predation-management-information-centre-(pmic)/predators-and-predation

Visit the Predation Management Centre's website ufs.ac.za/pmc for more information, or contact them at PredationMC@ufs.ac.za with any comments, questions, or personal accounts of leopards in your area or farm."

The following item was reported in the PMSA Newsletter APRIL 2021[1191]:

"1 Become part of the national predation structure

Predation Management South Africa (PMSA) invites all organisations, organised structures, specialists, and manufacturers in the livestock and wildlife ranching industries directly impacted by predation, to apply as members. PMSA, as a national entity, aims to mobilise engagement and coordination of activities to reduce the impact of predation through ecologically and ethically acceptable methods to protect the biodiversity of South Africa.

An annual membership fee (as determined by PMSA) for affiliated and directly affected members is payable. Statutory members like the national departments of agriculture and environmental affairs, and conservation authorities and tertiary and research institutions, are not subject to membership fees.

Refer to the PMSA Constitution and for more information on the objectives and functions of the entity and categories of membership, click here to view the constitution. pmfsa.co.za/images/news/PMSA_Constitution_._final.pdf"

The following item was reported in the PMSA Newsletter APRIL 2021[1192]:

"2 PMSA part of team exploring upgrade of fences around Karoo National Park

In 2020, CapeNature received an invitation from Agri Western Cape to attend a meeting about the about the management of damage-causing animals in the Karoo National Park (KNP). Neighbouring landowners were experiencing a high number of stock losses from large predators, particularly lions and hyena escaping the park. One of the outcomes of the meeting was to conduct an independent inspection of the KNP's game fence, specifically at identified problem areas, and to make recommendations regarding possible upgrades of the fence to meet CapeNature provincial standards.

CapeNature, the KNP, and predation specialist Niel Viljoen representing PMSA, were part of the inspection team who visited three properties, to note the general observations and specific concerns raised by the owners.

[1191] PMSA Newsletter APRIL 2021; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[1192] PMSA Newsletter APRIL 2021; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

General recommendations for implementation included the following:

1. Improving communication between park management and neighbouring landowners by dividing farming communities into sections around the park and establishing WhatsApp groups between the park and different groups. These groups could also communicate lion movement.

2. Compiling a general maintenance/patrol plan in cooperation with neighbouring properties.

3. Establishing an advisory committee (park forum) with different interested and affected parties around the park.

4. Reducing the number of lions as agreed upon.

5. Collaring all individuals is recommended.

6. Continuing with birth/breeding control of the lions.

7. Investigating the use of drones to increase the observation capacity of fence maintenance teams.

8. Considering the use of NGO's like accredited hunting organisations to help with basic fence maintenance, fence patrols, and basic repairs.

In conclusion, the boundary fence between private landowners and the park is to be regarded as an important asset by neighbouring property owners. They should take co-responsibility for the general day-to-day maintenance, especially the lower section up to about 1,5 m above ground level (the jackal-proof section). Reporting damage or where maintenance is needed, will increase the park's capacity, and help them focus their restricted capacity where needed most. Good communication between park management and neighbours will improve the general attitude of the parties, increase the park's capacity, and thereby ensure good neighbourliness, cooperation, and goodwill. To identify potential problems, find mutual solutions, and improve partnerships over the long term, it was recommended that involved parties, KNP, CapeNature, and Predation Management SA maintain this valuable interaction on a six-monthly basis.

Source – CapeNature report March 2021"

The following item was reported in the PMSA Newsletter APRIL 2021[1193]:

"***3 Mobile applications (apps) as a tool in predation management programmes***

In 2018, the PMC announced a new method of collecting information by creating mobile apps to collect detailed, standardised data on predation management on a large scale and over long periods. A single format was to be used for the results of different studies to be comparable. Until recently, the apps were compatible with Android mobile devices only (cell phones, tablets, and PDAs), but now also available for use on Apple devices.

For more information, read:

ufs.ac.za/docs/librariesprovider22/pmic-documents/mobile-applications-for-recording-predation-management-information.pdf

The application enables the following:

1. The collected information to cover a wide range of aspects relating to predation and its management. It assists research on predation, predation management, and the predators implicated in the damage. This allows for practical, responsible management practices to be developed for different scenarios.

2. The collaboration between research institutions and a good research framework, where the results of studies conducted in different areas can be compared.

3. The evaluation of the status of predation on livestock farms and wildlife ranches.

4. Patterns to be identified and predictions made about possible future predation using long-term data to take better preventative (precautionary) measures. Predation trends

[1193] PMSA Newsletter APRIL 2021; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 – NO COPYRIGHT – Version 5.0

and the effectiveness of predation management strategies can be monitored in different areas to further reduce predation.

All farmers, specialist predator hunters, researchers, predation management specialists, NGOs and others interested in collaborating on predation management programmes and using this tool for recording predation losses and predation management, can contact the PMC at PredationMC@ufs.ac.za."

The following item was reported in the PMSA Newsletter MAY 2021[1194]:

"1 A 13-year journey with predation monitor farms

The latest report from Niel Viljoen has been uploaded to the PMSA website – click here to view. pmsa.co.za/images/newsletters/Niel_Viljoen.pdf

The report summarises the extraordinary results obtained from the integrated livestock predation management programme and the impact of management on both livestock and predators. In 2008 there were 3 320 livestock losses due to predators, which is a substantial loss for farmers in both the wool and meat livestock industries. Over the 13-year period up to 2020, these losses gradually reduced to 1 133, a remarkable improvement of 65.9%.

At the start of the programme in 2008, 261 damage-causing predators were eliminated on the farms, but increased to 578 in 2020, representing an increase of 121,5%. Although this programme involves the management and removal of unwanted predators that cause losses on a continuous basis, predators such as black-backed jackal and caracal have learnt quickly that livestock kept in smaller enclosures during the night are easy prey. Black-backed jackal also get used to the presence of Anatolian guard dogs and simply outnumber and outsmart them during the daytime, causing substantial losses.

Predation management is therefore not about eliminating (generally referred to as predator control), but rather about utilising all available methods, including lethal and non-lethal methods with the intent to first manage livestock and then to control and manage predators.

The objective of the programme is to assist farmers to minimise losses due to predation, increase weaning percentages and consequently financial benefits, which then contribute to a financially viable farming enterprise."

The following item was reported in the PMSA Newsletter MAY 2021[1195]:

"2 Historical milestones for predation

The Predation Management Information Centre (PMiC)[1196] uploaded the updated version[1197] of 'Predation management in South Africa – historical milestones' to their website.

This document was compiled from information contained in official reports, letter, minutes, and publications, detailing the course of predation management in South Africa since the 1950s. In an effort to recreate institutional memory about the way predation management has been conducted in South Africa to date, it provides the foundation on which to build future efforts at coordinated predation management. Read the document here https://www.ufs.ac.za/docs/librariesprovider22/pmic-documents/predation-management-in-south-africa---historical-milestones-apr-2021.pdf?Status=Temp&sfvrsn=3746320_2"

The following item was reported in the PMSA Newsletter MAY 2021[1198]:

[1194] PMSA Newsletter MAY 2021; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[1195] PMSA Newsletter MAY 2021; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[1196] Should read 'Predation Management Centre (PMC)'
[1197] Version 4.2.
[1198] PMSA Newsletter MAY 2021; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

"3 Leopard info leaflets

Reviews of literature for the Predation Management Centre's leopard information leaflet series revealed that some of the recent leopard studies mention that no information is available on feeding trials conducted for leopards. In the early 2000s, the African Large Predator Research Unit (ALPRU) at the University of the Free State conducted feeding trials (food intake and digestibility) with captive African lions, leopards and cheetahs.

Publications stemming from these studies include:

Borstlap, Dirk Gerber, 2002. Intake and digestibility studies with captive African lions (Panthera leo), leopards (Panthera pardus) and cheetahs (Acinonyx jubatus). M.Sc. Agric. dissertation. University of the Free State, Bloemfontein, South Africa. http://scholar.ufs.ac.za:8080/xmlui/handle/11660/6127

De Waal, HO, Borstlap, Dirk, Combrinck, Willie & Schwalbach, Luis, 2005. Digestibility studies with captive African lions (Panthera leo) fed unprocessed donkey carcasses – a proposed method. ALPRU - Occasional Paper, 1 December 2005. https://www.ufs.ac.za/docs/librariesprovider22/alpru-documents/de-waal-et-al-2005_digestibility-studies-with-captive-african-lions-(panthera-leo)-fed-unprocessed-donkey-carcasses---a-proposed-method-(002).pdf?sfvrsn=482a6220_2

De Waal, HO, Borstlap, Dirk, Combrinck, Willie & Schwalbach, Luis, 2021. Digestibility studies with captive leopards (Panthera pardus) fed unprocessed donkey or horse carcasses. ALPRU - Occasional Paper, 7 May 2021. https://www.ufs.ac.za/docs/librariesprovider22/alpru-documents/de-waal-et-al-2021_digestibility-studies-with-captive-leopards-(panthera-pardus)-fed-unprocessed-donkey-or-horse-carcasses.pdf?sfvrsn=772a6220_2

Visit the ALPRU website for more information on these specific topics and ALPRU's activities: ufs.ac.za/alpru

Visit the Predation Management Centre's website ufs.ac.za/pmc for more information, or contact them at PredationMC@ufs.ac.za with any comments, questins or personal accounts of leopard on your farm or in your area."

The following item was reported in the PMSA Newsletter JUNE 2021[1199]:

"1 Predation monitor farms – report

Monitor farms were initiated by the National Woolgrowers Association of South Africa (NWGA) in 2008. The purpose was to create a sustainable platform where the continuing impact on livestock in different production environments could be measured and monitored. Also, new ideas could be developed and implemented towards securing a viable and sustainable livestock industry.

Monitor farms were established and are used:

- *as a scientific research platform to guide and advise the livestock industry;*
- *to inform and update training programmes for farmers, farmworkers and professional predation management specialists; and*
- *to secure a good and healthy biodiversity.*

Niel Viljoen's latest annual report provides feedback on 27 monitor farms distributed throughout six of the provinces, covering 136 214 hectares.

The different monitor farms are shown on the map below.

[1199] PMSA Newsletter JUNE 2021; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

To indicate the value of a monitor farm in respect of research, information and training, an example was selected and the challenges, findings, and goals accomplished were discussed.

Click here to view the full report: pmfsa.co.za/images/newsletters/Niel_Viljoen.pdf"

The following item (translation) was reported in the PMSA Newsletter JUNE 2021[1200]:

- **Predation management: Monitoring on farms reduces livestock losses**
- See article in Landbou.com dateed 23 Junie 2021:

netwerk24.com/landbou/Nuus/roofdierbestuur-monitering-op-plase-bring-daling-in-veeverliese-20210621

The following item was reported in the PMSA Newsletter JUNE 2021[1201]:

"2 Feeding behaviour of the leopard

The Predation Management Centre has compiled leaflets on a series of predators. This month they focus on the diet and feeding ecology of leopards in South Africa, which can be found here:

ufs.ac.za/docs/librariesprovider22/pmic-documents/04_03-leopard-feeding-behaviour.pdf?sfvrsn=e19d6020_4

Like black-backed jackals and caracals, leopards are opportunistic predators, which means that they prey on the most abundant prey available at any time. But leopards do show definite preferences for certain prey species in different areas. Leopards feed mainly on mammals and prefer rock hyrax (dassie) and medium-sized antelope (weighing between 10 and 40 kg) where these are available in the countryside.

In some regions of South Africa, leopards pose a problem on livestock farms and wildlife ranches. However, most studies conducted to date have found that leopards on farmland prefer natural prey over domestic livestock and introduced game.

Leopards are known to prey on smaller carnivore species such as caracal, black-backed jackal, and mongoose. According to one study, leopards on farmland kill and eat more carnivores than leopards in protected areas (nature reserves). Therefore, understanding the behaviour and ecology of different species of predators on farmland is essential to help devise practical and effective predation management strategies.

[1200] PMSA Newsletter JUNE 2021; http://www.pmfsa.co.za
[1201] PMSA Newsletter JUNE 2021; http://www.pmfsa.co.za

Visit the Predation Management Centre's website ufs.ac.za/pmc for more information, or contact them on email PredationMC@ufs.ac.za with any comments, questions, or personal accounts of leopard in your area or farm."

Farmers lose less livestock thanks to monitoring[1202]

- Article (translation) by Fred alette Uys
- The percentage livestock lost by farmers because of predators, declined from 13.2% in 2008 to 2.7% in 2020 during the 13-year-programme to manage predators on monitor farms.
- The livestock industry learnt valuable lessons from the programme of monitor farms across South Africa. Mr. Niël Viljoen, predator specialist for the livestock industry, describes the reduction in the number of livestock lost as a '*really remarkable happening*.' The advances in livestock and predator management was made possible because of experimenting, training, and research.
- In 2008 the National Wool Growers' Association (NWGA) set the ball rolling for the monitor farms, and since monitored predator management on 27 farms covering 136 214 ha in six provinces (the Northern, Western and Eastern Cape, Free State, KwaZulu-Natal, and Mpumalanga). The programme is also supported financially by the Red Meat Producers' Organisation (RPO).
- The objective with the farms is among other to provide a research platform to train and inform the livestock industry, to keep training programmes updated for farmers, farm workers and predator specialists and to create a healthy biodiversity.
- Farmers are supported to reduce the losses by predators and increase the weaning percentage of livestock, thus increasing the viability of the farm.
- '*Preventative predator management in conjunction with alternating use of different methods that are well managed during a single lambing season, is the key to a good weaning percentage*' said Viljoen.
- **Keep adapting**
- According to Viljoen the success of any of the management methods depends on the on the managerial skills of the farmer, as well as his adaptability because predators are very adaptable.
- The training and skills of farmers and farm workers are important to tackle the problem and protect the livestock, as well as conserving the environment. The NWGA, under the auspices of the Predation Management SA, is currently the only organisation in South Africa that provides predator training to farmers, farm workers and predator management specialists.

Mr. Niël Viljoen (front) presenting a demonstration as part of training in livestock and predation management (Photo: NWGA).

[1202] Landbouweekblad 1 July 2021, p 18.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal - Version 5.0

- Predators, especially black-backed jackals, are very adaptable, therefore farmers should stay informed to be able to adapt themselves. That is the reason why the monitor farms are so important.
- '*Continuous research offers the technology to farmers enabling them to change their approach to predators appropriately and still understand and manage their predator management programme in the interest of a sustainable and viable enterprise.*'
- Viljoen emphasised that predator management does not mean that all predators must be controlled, but that different methods – lethal and nonlethal – are used. It implies that livestock must first be managed, followed by controlling and managing of predators.
- The important lessons and achievements are summarised in the table of indicators for use in the future.

Indicators for the future	
Livestock management	**Predator management**
Training in livestock management	Training in predator management
Time of the year for lambing	Knowledge of predator behaviour and biology
Selected area on farm for lambing (topography)	Knowledge of predators existing in the area
Flock size during lambing	Knowledge of predator preferences and habitats
Size of the lambing area	Knowledge of catching and eating patterns
Daily livestock inspection during lambing	Understand the 'toolbox' and all the control methods
Exclusion by jackal-proof fences	Method – apply, manage and measure continuously
Isolation with electrified fences	Alternative strategies for predator management
System of daily recording	Preventative control of predators
Continuous evaluation of management	Continuous evaluation of management
Source: Predation Management SA	

- **Removing habitual animals**
- Good predator management strategies were one of the reasons for the decline in livestock losses.
- To achieve these results, a relatively large number of predators were controlled annually. Since 2012, 520 predators were on average killed.
- One of the focus areas of the programme was to remove habitual predators that are continuously causing losses. Predators such as black-backed jackal and caracal quickly learn that livestock are held at night in small camps and are easy prey. The black-backed jackals also became accustomed to Anatolian dogs by simply overwhelming them with numbers and outfoxing them during the day, causing enormous livestock losses.
- **Investment in the future**
- Since the inception of the programme, the financial losses of farmers on the farms declined, but it occurred commensurate with an increase in the cost of the management programme, especially considerable escalations in 2018 and 2020. It was among others because of different management strategies, such as erecting jackal-proof fences and electrified fences.
- Since the inception of the programme, just over R15 million was spent on the management system, while the losses of farmers were a little less than R12 million.
- '*Items such as fences and collars are long-term investments which will bear fruit in years to come, resulting in improved yields*' said Viljoen.

The devastating Covid-19 pandemic manifested in a third wave of infections in South Africa, therefore, under the provisions of the National State of Disaster, the country was moved to a phased Level 4 of Lockdown from 28 June to 11 July 2021. On 11 July 2021 the phased Level 4 of Lockdown was extended for another 14 days to 25 July 2021.

Version 5.0 - HO de Wet - Version 5.0

End of Version 5.0
23 July 2021

The updating, editing and electronic publication of this document is an ongoing project.

All documents with a bearing on the content of the historical timeline will be welcomed and appreciated.

All suggestions and editorial input will be welcomed.

Lines are numbered to facilitate easier reference of input.

Version 5.0 - HO de Waal

Annexure A

Prior to 28 April 1994, the Republic of South Africa was comprised of four provinces, namely the Cape of Good Hope, Orange Free State, Natal and Transvaal Provinces. The so-called 'homelands" were 10 enclaves of independent, or self-governing, territories in the provinces.

Annexure B

Since 28 April 1994, the Republic of South Africa is comprised of nine provinces, namely the Western Cape, Eastern Cape, Northern Cape, Free State, KwaZulu-Natal, North West, Gauteng, Mpumalanga and Limpopo Provinces.

Version