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Current application of CP tools is not sufficient to detect and measure the nature, extent and rate of land use change happening as a result of changes in the wildlife industry.

FALSE CONFIDENCE

ACTUAL LOSS ≠ MEASURED LOSS IN CONSERVATION ESTATE
## CONTRIBUTION CONSERVATION TARGETS

### Extensive Wildlife Areas / Near Natural/Natural Habitat

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Private Land / Game Farms</th>
<th>Communal</th>
<th>Protected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 mil ha marginal land - wildlife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.8% national estate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3x land than formal PA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GF 16 mil head of game - PA 6 mil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LAND-USE IMPACT → LANDSCAPE LEVEL
LAND COVER DID NOT CHANGE. INTEGRITY DID
LIMPOPO CONSERVATION PLAN

- Endangered Springbok Turf - Thorn veldt
- Corridor
► Additional area required to meet targets 11 556 km²
► Current PA network 13 670 km²
► 85% of current PA network
SMALL CAMP SYSTEMS
GAME AUCTION TRENDS

COLOUR VARIANTS (NWU, 2015) (excluding other trophy breeding activities)

- ROI 11% - 500%
- Ave sales ↑ 50% in 4y
- Contribution to turnover ↑ 200% in 4y
- 2014 - 18.3% of turnover of R1.8 billion

- Land prices Lephalale 2014: 10 000/ha to 35 000/ha

SA's wildlife industry is seeing a boom in prices paid for superior breeding animals – but it is a boom subject to deeply divided opinions among game experts.

Setting record prices has become norm for SA’s wildlife industry. The quest for the ultimate best of the big financial rewards. These account for a large part of the wildlife auctions rising from...
CONSERVATION PLANNING IMPLICATIONS
CONSERVATION PLANNING IMPLICATIONS

Double perimeter fence
LEGALITY ?
LEGAL FRAMEWORK

NEMBA: Legal Planning Frameworks to Conserve Biodiversity

Bioregional Plan + EMF’s + IDP’s + SDF

CP = Biodiversity sector input
Spatial Representation CBA’s

Rate of land cover / CP update too slow to address fast rate of land use change
TOOLS AVAILABLE

EIA
Breeding camps: barrier to movement + risks loss of vegetation character + habitat integrity.
► Not in listing notices - invoked when number/density of game very high
► Clearance of 1 ha or more - unlikely to be considered ‘clearing’
► Listing notice 3 – not covered

NO EIA REQUIRED – NOT REGULATED

PERMITTING
► Does not cover the full scope of emerging industry

NOT SUFFICIENT

EXEMPTION
► Issued based on size and “adequate enclosure” – in current form, no legal requirement to restrict sub-division

NOT REGULATED
TOOLS AVAILABLE

VOLUNTARY CERTIFICATION / INCENTIVES
- Financial incentives driving change in land-use
- No internalisation of biodiversity costs
- No reason for declaration – difficult to detect

BIODIVERSITY INCENTIVES NOT DEVELOPED

MUNICIPAL PLANNING
- C-Plan → BRP: game farms = agriculture / conservation zone
- Time frame for approval to implement → ineffective for addressing impact

FALSE SENSE OF SECURITY → MISINFORMED DEVELOPMENT DECISIONS
CONCLUSION

► Wildlife Industry changed – financial gains driving land-use change
► Current Conservation Planning tools don’t recognize nature, extent rate of change
► “3 x more land than PA” at risk of being transformed UNDETECTED
► Intensive breeding as land-use to be considered in landcover categories and conservation assessments and decision-making (loss in integrity not addressed)
► Landscape level impact not regulated at all
► No mechanisms for early detection or monitoring cumulative impacts

FALSE CONFIDENCE

ACTUAL LOSS ≠ MEASURED LOSS IN CONSERVATION ESTATE